



## City of Berkeley

# Berkeley Municipal Pier DRAFT Structural Assessment Report

November 2017

## Table of Contents

1.	Exec	cutive Summary	5
	1.1	Introduction	5
	1.2	Scope of Work	5
	1.3	Results of Structural Condition Survey	6
	1.4	Recommended Pier Repairs	6
2.	Gen	eral Description and Background	7
	2.1	Pier Description	7
	2.2	Background	8
3.	Exist	ting Conditions	9
	3.1	Evaluation Criteria	9
	3.2	Concrete Deck Panels	9
	3.3	Bent Caps	14
	3.4	Piles	15
	3.5	Summary of Structural Components	18
	3.6	Non-Structural	18
4.	Desi	gn Criteria	21
	4.1	Design Codes, References, and Standards	21
	4.2	Functional and Operational Criteria	22
	4.3	Design Loads and Loading Combinations	22
	4.4	Material Properties	23
	4.5	Geotechnical Criteria	24
	4.6	Accessibility Requirements	24
	4.7	Tidal Data	24
	4.8	Sea Level Rise	25
5.	Strue	ctural Condition Assessment	27
	5.1	Vertical Load Analysis	27
	5.2	Seismic Evaluation	28
	5.3	Corrosion Evaluation	46
6.	Con	ceptual Pier Rehabilitation Alternatives	47
	6.1	Pile Repairs	47
	6.2	Structural Concrete Repairs	49
	6.3	Pier Rehabilitation, Retrofit and Replacement Alternatives	53
7.	Proje	ect Permitting Considerations	65
	7.1	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	67

GHD | City of Berkeley – Berkeley Municipal Pier Structural Assessment Report | i

	7.2	Regional Water Quality Control Board	69
	7.3	California Department of Fish & Wildlife	69
	7.4	Bay Conservation Development Commission	73
8.	Cost	Estimates for Pier Repair and Rehabilitation Alternatives	73
9.	Sumr	nary and Recommendations for Pier Rehabilitation	76
10.	Grant	Funding Opportunities	78
	10.1	Grant Programs	78
	10.2	California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR)	78
	10.3	Coastal Conservancy	79
	10.4	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)	79
	10.5	Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	79

# Figure Index

Figure 2-1: Typical Plan and Section	8
Figure 4-1: Tidal Reference (Source: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)	25
Figure 4-2: Relative Sea Level Change Projects	26
Figure 5-1: Existing Pier Configuration (Partial Section)	29
Figure 5-2: Typical Bent Model	33
Figure 5-3: Typical Acceleration-Displacement Response Spectra (ADRS Spectra)	34
Figure 5-4: Displaced Shape and Pile Moment Diagram	36
Figure 5-5: Acceleration Displacement Spectrum for Existing Timber Pile Condition	37
Figure 5-6: Typical Model View for Retrofit Model P4	
Figure 5-7: Deflected Displacement of 1.5 Feet at Deck Level	39
Figure 5-8: ADRS for P4 Retrofit Model	40
Figure 5-9: Typical Model View For Retrofit Model P5	41
Figure 5-10: ADRS for P5 Retrofit Model	41
Figure 5-11: ADRS for P6 Retrofit Model	42
Figure 5-12: ADRS for P8 Retrofit Model	43
Figure 5-13: Typical Section of Model P8 Monopile Analysis Model	43
Figure 5-14: ADRS for P10 Model	44
Figure 5-15: Typical Section of P10 Two Pile Bent Replacement Pier	45
Figure 6-1: Pile Repair at Bent Cap	48
Figure 6-2: Fiberglass (FRP) Pile Jacket	49
Figure 6-3: Typical Bent Cap Repair	50

Figure 6-4: Deck Slab Repair	51
Figure 6-5: Typical Concrete Crack Repair	52
Figure 6-6: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P4 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and moment frames)	55
Figure 6-7: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P5 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and pile bent frames)	57
Figure 6-8: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P6 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles, moment frames and lightweight deck system)	58
Figure 6-9: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P7 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles, pile bent trusses and lightweight deck system)	59
Figure 6-10: Pier Replacement Alternative P8 – Monopile Pier with Precast Deck	61
Figure 6-11: Pier Replacement Alternative P9 – Monopile Pier with CIP Deck	62
Figure 6-12: Pier Replacement Alternative P10 – Precast Concrete Construction	63
Figure 7-1: CNDDB 5-Mile Radius Plant Occurrences	71
Figure 7-2: CNDDB 5-Mile Radius Wildlife Occurrences	72
Figure 8-1: Replacement Pier Length versus Estimated Cost	76
Figure 9-1: Alternative Rankings Graphic	78

## Table Index

Table 2-1: Summary of Pier Sections	8
Table 3-1: Condition Rating	9
Table 3-2: Pier Sections 1 and 2 Plumb Pile Deterioration	17
Table 3-3: Summary of Condition Ratings per Component	18
Table 5-1: Material Properties	27
Table 5-2: Model Variations for Seismic Pushover Analysis	34
Table 6-1: Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P1 - Concrete Repairs Only	53
Table 6-2: Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P2 – Concrete Repairs/Lateral Stiffening (add piles)	54
Table 6-3: Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P3 – Concrete Repairs/Lightweight Deck	54
Table 6-4: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P4 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and moment frames)	55
Table 6-5: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P5 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and pile bent frames)	57
Table 6-6: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P6 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add   piles, moment frames and lightweight deck system)	58

Table 6-7: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P7 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add   piles, pile bent trusses and lightweight deck system)	60
Table 6-8: Pier Replacement Alternative P8 – Monopile Pier with Precast Deck	61
Table 6-9: Pier Replacement Alternative P9 – Monopile Pier with CIP Deck	62
Table 6-10: Pier Replacement Alternative P10 – Precast Concrete Construction	64
Table 6-11: Pier Replacement Alternative P11 – Monopile Pier with Prefabricated Steel Bents Caps and Aluminum Truss Deck System	64
Table 7-1: Summary of Potential Permit Requirements	65
Table 8-1: Estimated Costs for Alternatives	74
Table 9-1: Alternative Rankings Table	77

## Appendix A

Engineer's Opinion of Preliminary Probable Construction Costs

## Appendix B

Pier Layout and Condition Rating

## Appendix C

Rehabilitation, Retrofit and Replacement Sketches

## Appendix D

**Underwater Inspection Report** 



**Record Drawings** 

# 1. Executive Summary

## 1.1 Introduction

The City of Berkeley (City) has contracted GHD Inc. (GHD) to perform above- and below-water condition surveys of Municipal Pier at Berkeley, California associated with a structural evaluation of a concrete pier used primarily for recreational purposes. An above-water survey was performed on foot above deck and from a boat below deck by GHD engineers. A below-water condition survey was performed by divers from Sea Engineering Inc. (SEI), a sub-contractor to GHD.

This report presents condition survey results and recommended pier repairs and retrofit alternatives for concrete piles, pier bent cap beams and deck panels as well as survey results and recommended repair or replacement for above-deck items. The existing pier is approximately 3,000 feet long and 22 feet wide, see Photo 1-1.

The City closed the pier to the public in July 2015 due to safety concerns resulting from extensive deterioration of the concrete deck panels.





### 1.2 Scope of Work

GHD was retained by the City of Berkeley to perform a condition evaluation and structural assessment for the Berkeley Municipal Pier located near the Berkeley Marina. The intent of the project is to perform a visual condition survey of the pier and prepare a report on the conditions along with conceptual repair alternatives and budgetary cost estimates. This review is limited to visual observations above deck and above water.

GHD's overall scope of work is to:

- 1) Perform a condition survey of the existing pier structure and identify structural components that require structural repair.
- 2) Provide a preliminary assessment of existing as-designed deck structure capacity to carry design basis loads.
- 3) Develop conceptual pier repair alternatives that will address structural deficiencies with respect to the load effects of dead, live, and seismic loads.

The structural condition survey was conducted in accordance with Chapter 31F of the 2016 California Building Code (MOTEMS) and ASCE Underwater Investigations Standard Practice Manual.

The structural condition assessment used information provided to GHD in the as-built drawings provided by the City. As-built drawings indicate existing pile locations, bent caps, panel sizes and reinforcement.

## 1.3 Results of Structural Condition Survey

The inspection and condition survey of Berkeley Municipal Pier was performed between August 7 and August 22, 2017.

The above-deck condition survey resulted in the following observations:

1. Concrete deck topsides are in fair condition. There are open and closed spalls at the longitudinal extremities of the concrete panels but generally are still serviceable. The exception is Section 2 which are the four-panel area that are in very poor condition with noticeable deflections and cracks.

The below-deck above-water condition survey resulted in the following observations:

- 1. Concrete piles above water are generally in poor condition. The majority of piles cracks or spalls, though no exposed timber piles. These piles should be repaired commensurate with good maintenance practice.
- 2. Most concrete deck panels are in serious condition. There are significant amount of spalling at the bottom concrete cover, exposing the bottom mat of rebar which permits corrosion at a rapid rate. It is likely that replacement concrete panels are required.
- 3. Concrete bent caps are generally in serviceable condition, with a few bent caps exhibiting localized concrete spalls or cracks. These bent caps should be repaired commensurate with good maintenance practice.
- 4. The timber battered piles are in critical condition, with the majority of the piles suffering severe section loss and almost all the piles no longer connected to the bent caps.

The below-deck below-water diver performed a Level 1 condition survey on all the piles, and a Level 2 condition survey at three underwater elevations (mudline, mid-water, and tidal zone). The underwater report is presented in Appendix D:

- 1. Piles were generally in poor condition similar to the above-water condition assessment.
- 2. Many piles have rock pockets and spalls, and a few piles have long cracks which should be repaired commensurate with good maintenance practice.

In general, the pier structure is currently inadequate for present-day design basis loadings.

### 1.4 Recommended Pier Repairs

Municipal Pier requires structural repair to reopen the pier for public use as a result of the deterioration of the concrete sustained due to exposure to the marine environment. In the absence of any repairs, the deterioration will continue to advance at an accelerated pace. Failure to address the concrete deterioration will result in additional sections of the pier structure that are no longer serviceable. Implementation of structural repairs reviewed in this study will provide a vertical live

load capacity of 100 pounds per square foot (psf) for Municipal Pier. This load capacity is in accordance with current building codes for public assembly areas.

Municipal Pier requires extensive repair to return the structure to serviceable condition and allow public use. The concrete panels require replacement in many locations due to extensive corrosion of the reinforcing steel. Concrete repairs are required in other areas to extend the service life of the structure and preclude significant structural damage in the future. Required repairs are fairly extensive which is expected considering the age and location of the structure, and primarily consist of concrete spall and crack repairs at the piles, bent caps and deck panels. Above deck, some timber guardrail railing and equipment such as light poles and benches require replacement. Typical repair details are provided in this report. Estimated construction cost for rehabilitation repairs required to return the pier structure to original design loads is \$27.36M. This cost does not include strengthening or retrofit of the pier for seismic loading.

## 2. General Description and Background

### 2.1 Pier Description

The Berkeley Municipal Pier was originally constructed in the late 1920s as access to an auto ferry terminal that crosses the bay. The original construction consists of concretejacked timber piles, precast concrete bent caps, and timber decking as shown in Photo 2-1. The pier started near the University Avenue offramp at Interstate 80, and extended approximately 3.5 miles into the bay, terminating near Treasure Island. After the San Francisco Oakland Bay



Photo 2-1: Original Pier Construction (Source: Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley)

Bridge was constructed in 1936, the pier ceased operations as a ferry terminal and was turned over to the City of Berkeley as a recreational pier in 1938.

By the early 1960s, the pier was reduced to 2.5 miles after the first mile was filled in to form the Berkeley Marina. Despite the shortened pier, the City determined that the maintenance costs for the pier was excessive and reduced the length of to approximately 3,000 ft. At this time, the inboard 2,000 ft was the original construction, and the outboard 1,000 ft was converted from a timber deck to concrete deck. However, the piles and bent caps remained the same.

In the mid-1980s, the inboard 2,000 ft was converted from timber deck to concrete deck while keeping the original piles and bent caps. GHD speculates that at some time in the 1990s, the

outboard 250 ft was completely replaced with new construction: piles, bent caps, and concrete deck.

Today, the pier exists in three distinct sections, as outlined in Table 2-1. The substructure consists of piles and bent caps, and the superstructure is the deck surface. A typical plan and section view of Berkeley Pier is shown in Figure 2-1.

Section	Bent	Date of Substructure	Date of Superstructure	Deck Panels	Panel Dimensions	Total Length
1	280-402	1920s	1980s	2	11'x15.5'	1,936 ft
2	402-451	1920s	1960s	4	5.5'x15.5'	784 ft
3	452-467	1990s	1990s	2	11'x14.5'	247 ft

Table 2-1: Summary of Pier Sections



TYPICAL PARTIAL PLAN



Figure 2-1: Typical Plan and Section

## 2.2 Background

Existing conditions for the pier were determined from GHD's condition survey and information provided by the City of Berkeley in the form of as-built pier drawings. GHD was retained by the City of Berkeley to perform a condition evaluation and structural assessment for the Berkeley Municipal Pier at the Berkeley Marina. The project scope of work includes a visual review of the pier structure and preparation of a report on the conditions along with conceptual repair and budgetary cost estimates.

Divers from Sea Engineering performed nondestructive evaluation of several concrete encased timber piles below water, and drilled four concrete cores to visually inspect the timber pile

conditions. GHD engineers performed nondestructive inspection of the pier, both above and below deck. This included both visual observations and performing soundings.

## 3. Existing Conditions

## 3.1 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria is based on the ASCE Standards of Practice for inspecting and assessing waterfront facilities. The condition rating is shown in Table 3-1.

#### Table 3-1: Condition Rating

Rating		Description
6	Good	No defects
5	Satisfactory	Minor defects
4	Fair	Hairline or small cracks smaller than 1/4 inches
3	Poor	Cracks larger than 1/4 inches, small spalls without exposed rebar
2	Serious	Large spalls with exposed rebar
1	Critical	Loss of reinforcing bars, severe deformities

## 3.2 Concrete Deck Panels

#### 3.2.1 Above Deck Surface

In Section 1 (bents 280 to 402), the above deck surface is generally in fair condition. There are two precast concrete deck panels that span the precast concrete bent caps, which are at 16 feet spacing. At the bent caps, there is a 6-inch gap between the deck panels that are filled with concrete or grout. Dowels extend from the top mat of rebars in the deck panels and are tied into the 6-inch closure. At every third panel, one end of the panel is free and is not tied into the bent cap.

The majority of the damage is located at the bent cap joints, particularly where the dowels tie into the bent caps. Typically, these are open spalls due to the dowel bars corroding and expanding against the concrete. Using a non-destructive sounding test, the 2 feet from the ends of the panels exhibit signs of delamination, where a planar crack separates a layer of concrete. This is a precursor to open spalls and likely was caused by the corroding dowel bars. A example of an open spall at the closure pour dowels is shown in Photo 3-1 and Photo 3-2



Photo 3-1: Open spall at Section 1 deck panel



#### Photo 3-2: Open spall at pile bent with exposed longitudinal rebar

In Section 2 (bents 402 to 501), the above deck surface is generally in critical condition. There are four precast concrete deck panels that span the precast concrete bent caps, which are at 16 feet spacing. At the bent caps, there is a 6-inch gap between the deck panels that are filled with concrete or grout. Based on the as-built drawings, these concrete panels were installed in the 1960s and do not appear to have been maintained.

From the top surface, many of the panels exhibit noticeable deflection, with a transverse crack at the centerline. Photo 3-3 shows a panel with significant deflection.



Photo 3-3: Severe Deflection at Section 2 Panel

Section 3 (bents 452-467) of the pier was likely installed in the 1990s and is in good condition. It consists of two precast concrete panels that span concrete bent caps at 16.5-feet spacing. There are no observable deterioration of concrete. Photo 3-4 shows the typical condition.



Photo 3-4: Typical Above Deck Condition of Section 3 Panels

#### 3.2.2 Below Deck Surface

Based on visual observations, the section 1 deck panels are generally in poor condition. The majority of the panels exhibit extensive open spalls that expose the bottom mat of rebar. Generally

the bottom mat of rebar appear to be heavily corroded but intact and bonded to the concrete core. However, without protection from concrete cover, the steel rebar is exposed to the elements and are subject to an advanced rate of deterioration. There are also numerous panels with closed spalls where the rebar is not visible, but are still exposed and is a precursor to open spalls. Photo 3-5 show the condition of Section 1 panels.



Photo 3-5: Typical Below Deck Condition of Section 1 Panels

The below deck surface for section 2 panels is generally in critical condition. There is extensive concrete spalling that expose the bottom mat of rebar, and in numerous panels, the bottom mat of rebar has corroded away or are no longer contributing to the structural load-bearing capacity of the panel and has deflected significantly in many locations. See Photo 3-6 for a typical Section 2 panel.



Photo 3-6: Typical Below Deck Condition of Section 2 Panels

Similar to the above deck surface, the panels in Section 3 are generally in good condition. There are no observable deterioration of the bottom concrete surface. Photo 3-7 shows the typical under deck condition of Section 3, and Photo 3-8 shows a comparison of the concrete condition between Sections 3 and 2 at bents 451 and 452.



Photo 3-7: Typical Below Deck Condition of Section 3 Panels



Photo 3-8: Comparison of Section 3 (left) and Section 2 (right)

3.2.3 Concrete Panel Summary

## 3.3 Bent Caps

The bent caps in Sections 1 and 2 are generally in fair condition with minimal rust bleeds and deterioration. A few bent caps are in poor condition with open spalls or cracks wider than 1/4-inch. See Photo 3-9. The bent caps in Section 3 are in good condition with no noticeable deterioration.



Photo 3-9: Example of Bent Cap with Open Spall in Section 1

## 3.4 Piles

#### 3.4.1 Concrete Encased Timber Piles

There are a total of 172 precast concrete bent caps within sections 1 and 2 with three concrete encased plumb timber piles per bent cap that appear to be from the original construction. The concrete encased timber piles are in poor condition due to widespread corrosion cracks, localized closed and open spalls, and isolated structural cracks. Pile damage is typically located in the splash zone, between the Mean High Water (MHW) elevation and the bent cap. At four locations, divers core drilled the concrete encasement to inspect the timber piles which appeared to be in fair condition. See Photo 3-10 and Photo 3-11 for cored piles and Photo 3-12 for underwater spall.



Photo 3-10: Core of concrete pile jacket



Photo 3-11: Inside view of concrete core showing timber pile



#### Photo 3-12: Underwater open spall on pile

The plumb piles within Sections 1 and 2 are summarized in Table 3-2 in increasing level of deterioration (some piles are double counted and therefore the table does not add up to 100%).

#### Table 3-2: Pier Sections 1 and 2 Plumb Pile Deterioration

Percentage	Deterioration				
20%	No visible deterioration				
7%	Corrosion staining without other visible damage				
60%	Vertical cracks up to 1/4" wide (may be more than one)				
15%	Closed spalls				
2%	Vertical cracks wider than 1/4"				
7%	Open spalls				
3%	Horizontal structural cracks up to 1/4" wide				

In section 3, there are a total of 16 bents with 48 plumb piles that are newer construction. The piles do not exhibit noteworthy deterioration.

#### 3.4.2 Timber Battered Piles

At every two bents, the record drawings indicated a battered timber pile that alternated between the north and south sides. However, the timber battered piles are typically missing or in severely degraded condition due to section loss from the effects of marine borer infestation and steel

corrosion resulting in piles disconnected from bent caps. In general, the battered piles provide no lateral stability to the Municipal Pier, as shown in Photo 3-13.



Photo 3-13: Timber Pile Disconnected from Bent Cap

## 3.5 Summary of Structural Components

Rating		Piles	Bent Caps	Panels
6	Good	8%	10%	6%
5	Satisfactory	26%	0%	0%
4	Fair	42%	61%	10%
3	Poor	17%	24%	17%
2	Serious	7%	6%	12%
1	Critical	0%	0%	53%

### Table 3-3: Summary of Condition Ratings per Component

## 3.6 Non-Structural

#### 3.6.1 Guardrails

The timber guardrails are in fair condition throughout the pier. There was no noticeable deterioration or section loss with the exception of the guardrails at Section 2 where the guardrails are deformed due to the deflection of the concrete panels. See Photo 3-14.





#### 3.6.2 Luminaires

The luminaires generally appear to be in fair condition. There are no significant deterioration at the concrete pedestal or steel poles. Below deck, the anchor bolts extend beyond the concrete panels and the ends exhibit corrosion or may be a source of corrosion. See Photo 3-15.



#### Photo 3-15: Typical Luminaire

#### 3.6.3 Benches

The benches are primarily constructed of reinforced concrete to act as a wind break with timber planks as bench seats. Most of the benches are in very poor condition with extensive spalling and rebar corrosion particularly at the base. Additionally, many benches are missing the seats. See Photo 3-16.



Photo 3-16: Typical condition of bench with concrete spalls

#### 3.6.4 Fish Washing Stations

There are two fish cleaning stations and appear to be in serviceable condition. The stands and backsplash are composed of concrete masonry units, and the surface appears to be precast concrete. See Photo 3-17.



### Photo 3-17: Fish Washing Station

#### 3.6.5 Restroom

The restroom building near the start of the pier is constructed out of concrete masonry units but was boarded up and inaccessible. There was little structural deterioration noted at the visible outside face. See Photo 3-18.



Photo 3-18: Restroom

## 4. Design Criteria

### 4.1 Design Codes, References, and Standards

The design requirements of the following design codes and standards will be incorporated into structural evaluation and conceptual design of the Municipal Pier rehabilitation and replacement alternatives:

- 1. American Concrete Institute, Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete, ACI 318-14 and Commentary (ACI 318R-14.)
- American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC), 2010 LRFD Specification for Structural Steel Buildings.
- 3. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures, ASCE/SEI 7-10, 2010.
- 4. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Seismic Design of Piers and Wharves, ASCE/COPRI 61-14, 2014.
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings, ASCE/SEI 41-13, 2013.
- 6. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 130, Waterfront Facilities Inspection and Assessment.
- California Building Standards Commission, 2016 California Building Code (CBC), Chapter 31F [SLC] Marine Oil Terminals.
- 8. American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), latest standards.
- 9. American Welding Society (AWS) D1.1, latest version.
- California Building Standards Commission, 2016 California Building Code (CBC), California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Parts 1 and 2, 2016. Design Codes, References, and Standards

## 4.2 Functional and Operational Criteria

Pier strengthening and retrofit modifications will be designed to meet 2016 California Building Code (CBC) requirements. Seismic analysis and design will be performed using displacement based design methods described in ASCE/COPRI 61-14 and the 2016 CBC, Chapter 31F, Marine Oil Terminals. Structural performance criteria for the Berkeley Pier are provided herein for use with these documents to meet the intent of the CBC for public access structures.

Berkeley Municipal Pier will be used for public pedestrian access for use as a recreational pier. The pier will be designed for maintenance vehicle use where repetition of loading is infrequent and cyclic loading and fatigue will not be considered.

Modifications and upgrades will be designed to bring the structure up to meet the intent of current code requirements for seismic design to ensure public safety when the facility is reopened for use.

### 4.3 Design Loads and Loading Combinations

Design loading combinations for Berkeley Municipal Pier are presented below. Design load combinations are summarized at the end of this section.

The pier will be designed for governing design load combinations per the requirements of the 2016 California Building Code. A summary of the recommended Design Criteria for the Berkeley Municipal Pier project follows:

- 1. <u>Dead Loads</u> Self weight of all structures and fixed equipment, including permanent elements such as piles, bent caps, deck planks, guard rails, appurtenances, and utilities.
- 2. Live Loads Public access

3. Seismic Loading

ASCE 7-10 Seismic Design Category: Site Class: Ss: S1: SD5: SD1:	D E 1.733g 0.687g 1.040g 1.100g
<u>CBC, Chapter 31F, Level 1</u> Site Class: Ss: S <sub>1</sub> : S <sub>DS</sub> : S <sub>D1</sub> :	E 0.558g 0.198g 0.884g 0.634g
<u>CBC, Chapter 31F, Level 2</u> Site Class: Ss: S <sub>1</sub> : S <sub>DS</sub> : S <sub>D1</sub> :	E 1.486g 0.547g 1.337g 1.312g

Loading	D	D+L	D+L+W	D+L+EQ	D-W	D+IM
D, Dead	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.9	1.2
L, Live		1.6	1.0	1.0		
W, Wind			1.0		1.0	
EQ, Earthquake				1.0		
IM, Impact						1.3

4. Load Combinations per the 2016 California Building Code

#### 5. Environmental Loading

Loading	Value
Wind (ASCE 7 3-sec gust, mph)	110
Exposure Category (ASCE 7)	D
Current (knots)	1.0
Significant Wave Height (Hs, feet)	3.1
Significant Wave Peak Period (seconds)	3.8

#### 4.4 Material Properties

The following structural material and properties are anticipated to be used for the project:

1. Concrete

All concrete shall be reinforced and utilize a mixture design suitable for the marine environment to meet the facility service life requirement.

2. Structural Steel

Plates and Bars	ASTM A131 or A36
Wide Flange Shapes	ASTM A992
Pipes	ASTM A53, Grade B
Tubes (Round or Rectangular HSS)	ASTM A500, Grade B
Angles and Channels	ASTM A36
All Other Plates	ASTM A992
Bolts	ASTM A3125, Grade A325
Welding Electrodes	ASTM E70XX
Nuts	ASTM A194 / ASTM A563, Grade A
Washers	ASTM F436 / F844
Stainless Steel	
All Shapes and Plates	ASTM A276 Type 316

All Shapes and Plates

3.

4. Corrosion Protection

Passive cathodic protection system shall be used on any steel piles consisting of zinc anodes or by providing additional sacrificial material thickness. Piles will also be coated to a depth to be determined below the mud line.

## 4.5 Geotechnical Criteria

Geotechnical criteria and parameters for final design of the pier rehabilitation shall be based on site investigations and engineering studies conducted. Geotechnical information on the subsurface material at the pier location is unavailable. Based on knowledge of waterfront structures located in nearby areas, it is assumed that the timber piles were driven into a relatively stiff sand layer underlying the soft clay (Bay Mud) material.

Elevation of bay mudline at the pier location is approximately -8 to -10 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). Based on information from a geotechnical report for a project at nearby Berkeley Marina, it is assumed that the mudline is underlain by an approximately 10 feet to 15 feet layer of very soft silty to sandy clay (Bay Mud). This in turn is underlain by layers of loose dense sand, soft to medium stiff sandy clay and medium dense clayey sand. Stiff clays are found below these layers. Prior to final design of the pier rehabilitation, a geotechnical investigation will be conducted at the project site.

### 4.6 Accessibility Requirements

The pier approach and slopes will meet ADA Guidelines.

### 4.7 Tidal Data

Design tide elevations are based on the tidal information for Berkeley, CA NOAA Station ID 9414816 for the tidal epoch 1983-2001 as shown in Figure 4-1. Project datum is mean lower low water (MLLW).

Level	MLLW Elevation (feet)
Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT)	7.6
Mean Higher High Water (MHHW)	6.1
Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW)	0.0
Lowest Astronomical Tide (LAT)	-2.1

https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/datums.html?id=9414816



Figure 4-1: Tidal Reference (Source: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)

### 4.8 Sea Level Rise

The pier structure can be designed to be adaptable to higher water elevations due to anticipated sea level rise. For example, the pier deck can avoid periodic flooding at higher water levels by using a fiberglass grating that allows seawater to pass through, also reducing uplift pressures on the pier. The pier can be designed with a higher deck surface elevation to prevent overtopping during most storm events. The approach to the pier can be raised to match the higher deck elevation by using lightweight fill material and adding a new walking surface with appropriate grades for ADA-accessibility. A new structure will be constructed of reinforced precast or cast-in-place concrete using a mix design suitable for the marine environment. Concrete structures in a marine environment utilize increased minimum concrete cover to reinforcing steel, epoxy coating of prestressing steel (if used), and use of a durable concrete with a low water to cementitious materials ratio with appropriate admixtures. Stainless steel, aluminum and fiberglass composite material can also be used to reduce corrosion and deterioration due to marine exposure and future immersion in seawater.

The year 2090 represents the 70 year service life of the pier structure (2020 estimated construction completion plus 70 years.) FEMA maps indicate 1% exceedance (100 year) Total Water Level Elevation of +10 feet at the pier site. The long-term sea-level rise predicted by the National Research Council between 2020 and 2090 is 2.65 feet per Figure 4-1 below. Adding 2.7 feet to represent the central estimate of sea level rise in year 2090 provides a design water elevation of +12.7 feet (NAVD88).



Estimated Relative Sea Level Change Projections From 2017 To 2100 - Gauge: 9414750, Alameda, CA

Year

#### Figure 4-2: Relative Sea Level Change Projects

The Base Flood Elevation (BFE) is the maximum elevation the water (including waves) is anticipated to reach during the 1% chance storm event; it represents the envelope of water during an extreme event. The Design Base Flood Elevation is obtained from the superposition of the water elevation observed during the 1% annual chance storm (including the astronomical tide, El Niño, and surge due to wind effects), the wave action, and the projected sea level rise at a determined time horizon. The time horizon considered for Berkeley Municipal Pier consists of a minimum service life of 70 years (2090.)

The 1% annual chance storm is a storm having an annual chance of being equaled or exceeded of 1% of the time. Various sources documenting extreme water levels, including FEMA at or near the project site are compared to determine design water elevation. FEMA's 2015 1% surge elevation (also referred to as SWEL or Stillwater Elevation) is used to compute for the base flood elevation. From the most recent maps issued by FEMA, the SWEL at Municipal Pier is approximately +10 feet (NAVD88.)

The design wave height is 3.1 feet. The Base Flood Elevation is computed with the portion of the wave that stands above the Stillwater level. When the waves propagate nearshore, the waves tend to shoal, and the wave crest is located at a distance above the Stillwater level of approximately 70% of its total height. Therefore, the wave height component to be added to the Base Flood Elevation is 2.17 feet. Adding this to the 1% SWEL of 10 feet and the Sea Level Rise of 2.7 ft. leads to a Design Base Flood Elevation of 14.9 ft NAVD88 for 2090.

Recommended Design Base Flood Elevations:

• 70 year Service Life: 14.9 ft-NAVD88

# 5. Structural Condition Assessment

### 5.1 Vertical Load Analysis

#### 5.1.1 Methodology

The basic methodology of the initial study was to determine the approximate existing structural capacity of the pier by conducting analyses using anticipated vertical loads, information derived from record information and taking into account deterioration noted during the site survey. Material properties will be determined either by physical tests or assumptions made considering the degree of deterioration and time of construction. Structural condition survey of the pier indicates significant deficiencies, and design repair concepts will be determination of the approximate capacity of the pier to resist inertial loads to achieve a minimum performance level during a seismic event.

Based on the City of Berkeley Department of Public Works Plan No. 3549, File 102 B-63, dated December 1961, the planks for Section 2 are 5.5 feet wide, 15 feet long, and 9-5/8 inches thick. There are two different slab reinforcing configurations, varying between 10 or 11 #7 reinforcing bars in the bottom mat, and 5 #4 bars in the top mat. The concrete and steel rebar strength are not specified, but are assumed to be 2,500 psi and 60,000 psi respectively. The evaluation criterion for the structural materials is shown in Table 5-1 below.

Element	Yield Point (psi)	Allowable Shear Stress (psi)	Allowable Bending Stress (psi)	Compressive Strength (psi)	Modulus of Elasticity (psi)
Concrete		95		3,000 <sup>2</sup>	3,120,000
Reinforcing Steel	33,000 <sup>1</sup>				29,000,000
Timber Piles (Douglas Fir)			1,200 <sup>2</sup>		1,500,000

#### Table 5-1: Material Properties

Notes:

1. Value assumed for analysis given construction era.

2. Assumed value for analysis.

3. Value derived from prior studies.

#### 5.1.1 Concrete Deck Panels

As-built drawings for the 11 feet wide concrete panels in Section 1 were not available, and is estimated based on the available drawings for Section 2. For the analysis, similar reinforcing spacing were used, with #7 at 6 inches in the bottom mat, and #4 at 12 inches in the top mat.

These panels were analyzed as simple spans under these load cases:

- 1. As-built, 100 psf live load
- 2. Loss of 50% bottom mat, 100 psf live load
- 3. Complete loss of bottom mat, 6 inch thick uncracked section, 20 psf live load

In load case 1, the bottom mat of reinforcing bars provides about two times as much capacity for vertical loads only. This means for vertical loads only, the bottom mat rebar can lose as much as half of the steel (load case 2) and still support the full 100 psf live load. However, in load case 3, without the bottom mat, the concrete panels are well over capacity and insufficient to carry a reduced live load.

The loss of the bottom mat of reinforcing was taken into account for the condition rating. Panels that appeared to have lost more than 50% of the bottom mat of rebar were considered critical.

#### 5.1.2 Piles

The vertical piles supporting the pier structure are reinforced concrete jacketed timber piles which are assumed to extend to just below the mudline while the timber piles extend to the bearing depth. The vertical or plumb piles derive their lateral resistance from the passive pressure of the soil and from the flexural rigidity of the structural element.

The piles vary in length along the length of the pier and are assumed to extend 10 to 15 feet into the sand layer. Due to the stiffness of the sand layer the piles are believed to be driven to, the assumption has been made that a large portion of the vertical capacity of the piles is derived from end-bearing on the relatively stiff sand layer rather than skin friction from the soft clay layers penetrated. The piles were likely driven using a gravity hammer. Properties for the timber was used in the analyses.

The vertical piles, as constructed, have sufficient axial capacity for the vertical loading used in the evaluation. Lateral loading demand for the vertical piles has been reviewed against the capacity available and the results are discussed in Section 7. The pier was designed prior to current seismic design codes and consideration was not given for probable earthquake ground motions from earthquake faults in the region.

#### 5.1.3 Pier Framing Elements

The pier substructure consists of 268 bents comprised of bent caps spanning 16 feet between the piles. The bent caps consist of reinforced concrete beams transverse to the centerline of the pier, with dimensions of 24-inches wide by 18-inches deep sections as shown on the record drawings.

As noted above, the concrete bent caps have open and closed spalls in numerous locations. The cause of the spalling is likely corrosion of the reinforcing steel. The porous nature of concrete combined with shrinkage cracks and cracks created by tensile loads in the beams have allowed salt from the moisture to reach the reinforcing bars. Chloride in the saltwater reduces the passivity of the cement, which allows the corrosion to accelerate. The resulting corrosion of the bars has expanded the volume of the steel causing the concrete to become delaminated.

## 5.2 Seismic Evaluation

#### 5.2.1 Discussion of Structural Analysis for Load Capacity

Three-dimensional finite element computer models were developed for structural analysis of Berkeley Municipal Pier using the structural software SAP2000. The initial structural analyses conducted included a capacity evaluation using vertical loads consisting of an area live load suitable for the pier structure. The strength requirements for the repair design were determined from the results of the analyses. The lateral part of the study used the computer models to analyze the pier for inertial loading from an earthquake. Inertial loading imposed on the pier due to a seismic event can be expected to cause potentially extensive damage to the substructure given the lack of ductile detailing in the structural elements provided in the original construction. A strengthening upgrade study of the pier structure was also performed.

As part of the initial structural assessment, calculations were performed to determine the existing capacity of the pier elements for resistance to vertical self-weight (dead) and transient (live) loads. A typical section of the pier structure was modeled using a finite element model developed for the purpose of the structural analysis. The computer models consist of nominally rectangular planar shell elements representing the deck slab. Frame elements have been used to model the beams and piles. An example of the finite element model is shown on Figure 5-1.



## Figure 5-1: Existing Pier Configuration (Partial Section)

Non-linear springs were included

in the finite element models along the embedded length of the piles to represent the lateral loaddeflection (p-y) characteristics of the soil on the element. The pile tip was supported assuming a fixed boundary condition with no vertical or horizontal movement allowed. Because pile bending actions dominate the behavior for lateral analysis, skin friction and pile tip springs were not modeled.

For the structural analysis, piles were modeled considering the effects of the lightly reinforced concrete jacket from the pile cap down to the mudline. Modeling of the concrete jacket was cut off 2 feet below the assumed mud line elevation. The wood pile was modeled as a section tapering from a 14 inch diameter at the top to a 7 inch diameter at the bottom tip and was assumed to be 70 feet long with 52 feet of embedment below the mudline. The upper 18 feet below the pile cap was modeled as a composite section with a timber core and an exterior concrete jacket.

It was anticipated that lateral movements causing pile moments below the mudline at near the timber pile bending strength would be quite large and would be well past the displacement capacity of the pile to pile cap connection. The pile top connection to the pile cap was considered for the pushover analysis to have very limited strength and stiffness with a small spring value added

between the pile and pile cap for some continuity rather than a simply pinned connection. The maximum internal force and displacement results from these analyses were used to assess the load capacity of the existing structure and determine the critical elements for the vertical load distribution.

To determine the structural response of the pier structure due to earthquake loading, pushover analyses were utilized to determine the structural demand of the existing pier structure due to lateral loads resulting from inertial effects due to ground motion during a seismic event. The pushover analysis is a static, non-linear procedure in which the magnitude of a predetermined structural loading pattern is incrementally increased. The structure can be pushed to a target displacement level and the results assessed. The analysis is considered a process that accounts in an approximate manner for the redistribution of internal member forces that occurs when the structure is subjected to inertia loads that can no longer be resisted within the elastic range of structural response. The critical structural elements in the nonlinear lateral analyses were determined.

The two key elements of a performance-based assessment are capacity and demand. Demand will be the representation of the earthquake ground motion. For the purposes of the assessment the displacement demand is an estimate of the expected maximum response of the pier during the earthquake ground motion. Capacity is the representation of the structure's ability to resist the seismic demand. The capacity depends on the strength and deformation capacities of the individual components of the structure.

Traditionally, seismic evaluations and retrofit designs used a linear elastic, code-based approach. The adequacy of the structure was assessed to resist lateral forces with a specified base shear representing the inertia loads due to a seismic event. The design remains linear in the sense that the seismic load is applied and the structural components are designed to resist the resulting stresses without yielding. Recently the trend has shifted toward a "performance-based" approach to seismic retrofit design. This performance based approach is accomplished with the pushover demand-capacity analysis described above.

#### 5.2.2 Seismic Assessment Methodology

Several design standards exist that describe performance based design methods usable for demand capacity analysis and pushover methods. Each method is a partial fit, as explained below, for the analysis and potential seismic strengthening of Berkeley Pier used for public access but not for ship berthing or mooring at all.

The approach chosen by GHD is the use of ASCE 61 as the primary reference for the displacement based design methodology for pile supported pier structures which for the intended purpose is essentially the same as CBC Chapter 31F. ASCE 61 provides appropriate information for connection modeling, soil spring modeling, and limitations of pile strains along with modeling parameters used for pile supported piers. However, earthquake loading from those two documents was determined to be inappropriate for publicly occupied existing facilities such as Municipal Pier. The higher earthquake loading prescribed by ASCE 41 is then used in this evaluation of existing conditions and for the modification schemes proposed along with Life Safety and Collapse Prevention performance objectives commonly used for publicly occupied structures.

ASCE 61-14 "Seismic Design of Piers and Wharves" is a design standard developed by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) for performance based design of new pier and wharf structures. This standard focuses primarily on the design of new port facilities such as container wharves and similar ship berthing facilities. This document is based heavily on the Port of Long

Beach standards for seismic design of new facilities at their port. This document provides focus on the performance of pier structures and their common components such as piles and pile caps which differs significantly from the construction of typical buildings. ASCE 61 assumes these piers are not typically publicly occupied facilities. The performance based design method used is very similar to CBC Chapter 31F and ASCE 41 described below.

The Marine Facilities Division of the California State Lands Commission has formalized the seismic design of marine structures through the "Marine Oil Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standards" (MOTEMS). This standard has been codified as Chapter 31F "Marine Oil Terminals" in the 2016 California Building Code (CBC). This design standard represents a codified means to design or assess existing waterfront structures. Although the standard is intended for use on marine and waterfront structures, its use is primarily focused on marine oil terminals subject to heavy loading where environmental damage resulting from oil spills due to a seismic event is a main concern. CBC Chapter 31F utilizes a performance-based seismic assessment approach. This standard does provide some useful guidance on wood piling which is of use for this project. Chapter 31F assumes these piers are not typically publicly occupied facilities.

ASCE 41-13 "Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings" is another standard also developed by ASCE. This standard provides methods for performance based demand-capacity analysis and pushover analysis with particular emphasis on existing buildings and publicly occupied facilities. ASCE 41 provides little guidance for the capacity calculations and behavior of pile supported structures as compared to ASCE 61 and CBC Chapter 31F. ASCE 41 does however provide the best guidance on earthquake demands appropriate for use with existing publicly occupied facilities.

All standards discussed above are probability based and quantify risks associated with differing seismic events. The methodologies prescribed determine where and how inelastic actions may occur (i.e., by inelastic rotations in specified plastic hinge locations) and to protect other locations such as the pier deck and prevention of other failure modes such as shear by assuring that these locations remain elastic.

In the basic sense, force applied to any structure causes the structure to displace. Within the structural elements, the applied forces are associated with stresses, and the displacements with strain. The performance-based assessment method offers a clearer look at how a structure will respond during an earthquake, taking into consideration the post-yield (nonlinear) behavior of the materials. The structure is pushed beyond the elastic (yield) limit and hinges form in the elements into the plastic range of the materials.

CBC Chapter 31F defines the earthquake ground motion for use in the assessment as a Level 1 earthquake defined as 50%/50yr earthquake that has a 50 percent probability of being exceeded within 50 years (72-year return period). This level is defined as the structure sustaining no significant and only limited, repairable damage. The Level 2 earthquake is defined as 10%/50yr earthquake that has a 10 percent probability of being exceeded within 50 years (475-year return period). This is defined as the structure sustaining repairable damage and incurring controlled inelastic structural behavior without collapse during a major earthquake.

ASCE 61 uses the same defined earthquake ground motions as CBC Chapter 31F for an Operating Level Earthquake (OLE) corresponding to Chapter 31F Level 1, and for a Contingency Level Earthquake (CLE) corresponding to Chapter 31F Level 2. ASCE 61 adds a Design Earthquake Level (DE) which is taken from ASCE 7 "Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures". This earthquake is taken as 2/3 of the ground motions caused by an earthquake with a

2% probability of being exceeded in 50 years. These earthquakes are intended for use with new structures and not necessarily for evaluation and upgrade of existing facilities.

ASCE 41 uses unique ground motions and performance standards that are appropriate for the evaluation existing structures that are publicly occupied and the strengthening or retrofit of those existing structures. Two earthquakes are typically used for evaluation of existing structures defined as Basic Safety Earthquake-1E (BSE-1E) and Basic Safety Earthquake-2E (BSE-2E) earthquakes. BSE-1E is defined as a 20%/50yr earthquake (225 year return period) and the BSE-2E is defined as a 5%/50yr earthquake (975 year return period). The performance objective in ASCE 41 are Life Safety for the BSE-1E earthquake and Collapse Prevention for the BSE-2E earthquake. As can be seen particularly with reference to the return period in years, the earthquake prescribed by ASCE 41 are larger than those typically used for other standards. The performance standards of Life Safety and Collapse Prevention are more lenient that those of ASCE 61 and CBC Chapter 31F where minimal damage or repairable damage are the performance goals.

#### 5.2.3 Nonlinear Static Pushover Analysis Method

Nonlinear static analysis, commonly referred to as pushover or collapse analysis, is a method for determining the ultimate load and deflection capability of a structure using an inelastic procedure. Local nonlinear structure effects, such as flexural hinges at the member joints, are modeled and the structure is deformed or "pushed" until enough hinges form to develop a collapse mechanism or until the plastic deformation limit is reached at the hinges. The goal of the evaluation is determination of the ultimate displacement capacity of the structural components ( $\Delta_c$ ).

A linear elastic analysis provides a good indication of the elastic capacity of structures and indicates where first yielding will occur, however it is unable to predict failure mechanisms and account for the redistribution of forces during progressive yielding of the components of a structure. The nonlinear (inelastic) analysis procedures better demonstrate how structures perform by identifying modes of failure and the potential for collapse. Use of inelastic analysis attempts to better understand a structure's behavior when subjected to a major earthquake, where the assumption is made that the elastic capacity of the structure will be exceeded. The inelastic behavior of structural elements such as the deck beams, bent caps and piles is one of the nonlinear parameters used in the analyses.

The failure mechanism of the pier structural components must be identified and their nonlinear properties defined accordingly. Factors include material inelasticity, geometric effects, non-linear soil-foundation-structure interaction. The nonlinear pushover analyses utilized inelastic properties of the structural materials including the stress and strain characteristics of the concrete, reinforcing steel and timber in the case of the pier piles. Non-linear springs were used to represent the soil-structure (pile) interaction in the computer models. Lateral springs consist of load-deflection (p-y) response of the Bay Mud.

A nonlinear analysis such as a pushover procedure must be performed to determine an approximate force-displacement capacity diagram for the structure. The finite element computer model is modified during the analysis to account for the reduced resistance of yielding components. A lateral force distribution is again applied until additional components yield. Hinges representing

post-yield behavior begin to form as the structure is incrementally pushed in subsequent steps. The process is continued until the structure becomes unstable or a predetermined displacement target is reached.

#### 5.2.4 Nonlinear Pushover Procedure

The nonlinear static pushover analysis used for the assessment of the pier utilized the method described above. The pushover procedure involves converting the typical acceleration versus period response spectra into a spectral acceleration versus displacement response plot.

The basic capacity and demand parameter for the analysis is the lateral displacement of the pier. For the nonlinear static procedure used to evaluate the capacity of the pier, the pushover analysis was performed using the SAP2000 finite element structural analysis program. An increasing monotonic lateral load pattern was used to displace the individual bent models and the results reviewed at each load step to evaluate formation of the hinges. The analyses included the effects of P- $\Delta$ , which is the additional moment imposed on a pile by the axial load acting on a moment arm created by lateral displacement at the top of the pile. This effect can be significant for a pier or bridge structure. A typical bent model for the pier is shown on Figure 5-2.

The pushover procedure creates a capacity curve or spectrum that represents the displacement capability of the structure being considered. This curve is plotted on top of demand curves or spectrums that represent the earthquake being considered. Earthquake demand curves are repeated for different levels of energy dampening which effectively scales the earthquake response that the structure must accommodate. Figure 3 shows a classic acceleration displacement response spectra with the pushover curve and demand curves plotted together.



Model



# Figure 5-3: Typical Acceleration-Displacement Response Spectra (ADRS Spectra)

A unique performance point is calculated by iteration using the substitute structure method where successive trials for the effective period,  $T_{eff}$ , are calculated until a displacement matching a point on the capacity curve is found. For structures with insufficient strength or stiffness, no performance point may exist since the capacity curve may not reach one of the demand spectrum lines plotted.

Each model variation was subjected to the same procedure described here. A short summary of the results for each is described below.

#### 5.2.5 Results of Seismic Assessment

Static non-linear pushover analyses were performed to evaluate the performance of the pier in its existing condition and then to evaluate several different options for strengthening the existing pier or for potentially replacing the pier with new structure. A total of seven variations of the model were run to that end. Table 5-2 lists the seven options studied by finite element pushover analysis.

Pier Alternative	Option Type	System Description
P1	Rehabilitate existing structure only. No seismic strengthening.	Maintain existing. No retrofit elements.
P4	Rehab and retrofit for seismic strengthening.	Add 24" steel pipe piles with steel moment frames at top of piles.
P5	Rehab and retrofit for seismic strengthening.	Add 48" cantilevered steel pipe piles
P6	Rehab and retrofit for seismic strengthening.	Add 18" diameter steel pipe piles with moment frames, replace deck with lightweight system.

Table 5-2: Model Variations for Seismic Pushover Analysis

P7	Rahab and retrofit for seismic strengthening.	Add 36" cantilevered steel pipe piles, replace deck with lightweight system.
P8	Pier replacement.	30" diameter steel pipe monopile with concrete pile cap and deck
P10	Pier replacement.	24" precast concrete piles with concrete pile cap and deck

Pushover analyses were performed for each of the models listed. Analysis results were saved at selected steps of each analysis as the structure lateral displacement increased. The structure displacement is plotted for the final step of each analysis.

Each model section was assessed for two levels of earthquake (BSE-1E and BSE-2E) using ASCE 61 procedures as described in the Seismic Assessment Methodology section above.

With the exception of the timber piles, calculations and analysis performed for the pier structure based on the design criteria above, indicate that the pier structure, with structural deficiencies repaired, is adequate for these design basis loadings. The most critical structural element in the pushover analysis for each model is the pile.

#### 5.2.6 Structure Analysis Models

#### Model P1

Figure 5-2 above represents the basic model of existing conditions. For this condition, bending in the piles just below the mudline resists lateral movement of the deck structure due to earthquake. Timber piles are typically not modeled with non-linear hinges since the have very little rotational capacity beyond their ultimate moment strength. In this case the model was pushed at the top deck a distance of 2.5 feet and the resulting pile moments were monitored. Figure 5-4 shows a plot of the displaced shape at a deflection of 1.75 feet at the deck with the corresponding moment distribution in the piles for that deflection. The pile moment at this push step is indicated as 49 kip-feet.

The pile capacity of the timber pile section at approximately 11 inches in diameter was calculated to be about 45 kip-feet. This indicates that the maximum displacement of the structure is about 1.75 feet when the pile bending capacity was reached.

Further the pushover curve created was evaluated against the required BSE-1E and BSE-2E earthquakes. A plot of the structures ADRS spectra is shown in Figure 5-5. The green line is the structural capacity curve and the red lines are demand capacity curves for various damping levels. As can be seen by comparison to Figure 3, there is no intersecting performance point indicating a successful solution. This means in this case that the demand deflection far exceeds the capacity of 1.75 feet at the maximum pile moment. For the maximum earthquake case the structure can be expected to suffer extreme deflections and possible collapse.

This information informs us about the maximum displacement that can be tolerated in existing structure when combined with retrofit schemes. In this case, retrofit schemes must limit the displacement to 1.75 feet or less and must also have a capacity curve that intersects successfully with a performance point on the ADRS plot.


Figure 5-4: Displaced Shape and Pile Moment Diagram



Figure 5-5: Acceleration Displacement Spectrum for Existing Timber Pile Condition

#### Model P4

Model P4 includes an option to add a pair new 24" diameter steel pipe piles at 32 feet on center. To help control deflections the pile tops are joined by beams capable of developing end moments which creates a fixed pile top condition.

Figure 5-6 shows a screen shot of this model where a 32 foot representative section of the pier is modeled and pushed across the narrow direction of the deck indicated in red. Green colored elements represent the new pipe piles joined by a moment frame beam shown in yellow. The right side of the figure shows the typical new bent added at 32 feet on center.



Figure 5-6: Typical Model View for Retrofit Model P4

Figure 5-7 shows a plot of the deflected shape at a horizontal pushover displacement of 1.5 feet corresponding to the performance point plotted for the structure in Figure 5-8.



Figure 5-7: Deflected Displacement of 1.5 Feet at Deck Level



#### Figure 5-8: ADRS for P4 Retrofit Model

Figure 5-8 shows the green pushover curve for the retrofit pile moment frame model. The green curve is much taller indicating much more capacity compared to the original structure shown in Figure 5. The yellow line represents the the plot of each trial evaluation of effective structural period and it's corresponding displacement value. A solution, the performance point, is found where the yellow line intersects the green line. This occurs at 1.5 feet of deck displacement.

At a displacment of 1.5 feet non-linear actions in the new structure are seen in the moment frame beams. Nono-linear compression of the soil springs occur but no hinging of piles occurs.

The mximum performance point displacement of 1.5 feet is also within the expected limits of displacement for the original structure therefor this is will be a successful solution for retrofitting the existing pier.

#### Model P5

Model P5 is very similar to model P4 except that no moment frame beam is used to join the pile tops. Piles must catilever from the base which ends up requiring larger diameter piles. Figure 5-9 shows a screen shot from this model.

Figure 5-10 shows the ADRS plot for this retrofit scheme. In this plot the performance point at the intersection of the green and yellow lines occurs at about 1.4 feet. This demand displacement is less than that which can be tolerated by existing timber piles so it is a successful retrofit scheme. In this case essentially all of the non-linear action occurs in the soil springs. The cantilevered piles remain elastic for this solution.



Figure 5-9: Typical Model View For Retrofit Model P5



Figure 5-10: ADRS for P5 Retrofit Model

#### Models P6 and P7

These models options are essentially identical to Alternatives P4 and P5 respectively with the addition of replacing the existing pier deck with a new lightweight option that reduces the structural mass and therefore reduces the structural demands. As a result, correspondingly smaller pile sections are utilized.

Figure 5-11 shows the ADRS plot for model P5. The performance point occurs at a deflection of approximately 1.1 feet which is well within the expected deflection capacity of the original timber pile structure.



#### Figure 5-11: ADRS for P6 Retrofit Model

Performance point displacement for the P7 model is similar to the P5 model at about 1.5 feet.

#### Model P8

The P8 model is for a completely new pier structural system proposed as a replacement option for the entire pier. As such the selection of pier configuration and structural components is completely open. Option P8 considers the use of a monopile support system with single piles spaced at 32 feet on center. The pile is capped with a cast in place or pre-cast pile cap and the deck is a pre-cast pre-stressed 12 inch thick deck section.

Figure 5-12 shows the ADRS for the P8 model. For this solution the performance point occurs at about 1.5 feet. For this case essentially all inelastic non-linear action occurs in the soil springs. The cantilevered monopile section remains elastic up to the performance point demand displacement.

Figure 5-13 shows a screen shot of a two pile section (64 feet total length) of the proposed monopile pier.



Figure 5-12: ADRS for P8 Retrofit Model



Figure 5-13: Typical Section of Model P8 Monopile Analysis Model

#### Model P10

The P10 model is for a completely new pier structural system proposed as a replacement option for the entire pier. As such the selection of pier configuration and structural components is completely open. Option P10 considers the use of a two pile bent support system with piles spaced at 32 feet on center. The pile is capped with a cast in place or pre-cast pile cap and the deck is a pre-cast pre-stressed 12 inch thick deck section.

Figure 5-14 shows the ADRS for the P10 model. For this solution the performance point occurs at about 1 foot. For this case a significant amount of non-linear deformation occurs within the precast pile at about 18 feet below the mudline. Some inelastic actions are also observed at the pile to pile cap connection. This deformation would be addressed by proper detailing of the pile to cap connection for the required ductility. For the design earthquake, some pile damage could be expected well below the mudline. This damage would be unrepairable.



Figure 5-15 shows a screen shot of a two pile section (64 feet total length) of the proposed monopile pier

Figure 5-14: ADRS for P10 Model



#### Figure 5-15: Typical Section of P10 Two Pile Bent Replacement Pier

#### **Summary of Structural Deficiencies**

Deficiencies noted for the existing pier during the seismic assessment include lack of flexural strength of the pile to pile cap connection due to an inadequate quantity of embedment of the longitudinal reinforcing at the pile-deck connection. Also, timber pile bending strength limits the deflection capacity of the pier deck. Seismic displacement demands far exceed the timber pile deflection capacity.

#### **Conceptual Retrofit Strategy - Performance Goal**

The basic approach to the seismic retrofit design strategy is to improve the probable seismic performance of the pier or otherwise reduce the existing risk to an acceptable level. The selected retrofit scheme should provide a survival (no-collapse) limit-state protection for the 975 year return period earthquake ground motion (BSE-2E) and life safety protection for the 225 year return period ground motion (BSE-1E). The concept would allow for damage to occur, but prevent a collapse mechanism from forming due to the largest earthquake considered. Retrofitting the pier to withstand the BSE-2E earthquake with only minor damage is unlikely to be economically feasible.

The basic methodology for retrofitting the existing structure is to add structural elements that resist part of the earthquake demands and therefore limit the displacement of the existing pier to within acceptable levels. Several different options have been evaluated that meet these requirements.

#### 5.2.7 Seismic Assessment Summary

The seismic assessment of Municipal Pier consisted of a linear elastic response spectrum analysis of the complete structure followed by nonlinear pushover analyses of representative bent sections at locations along the pier. The results of the analyses showed that per the displacement capacity-demand assessment method used, the existing pier does not satisfy any criteria for the earthquakes evaluated. The existing structure will be unstable for the earthquake levels checked and should either be retrofitted or replaced.

Further structural analysis will be performed during the design phase of the rehabilitation and strengthening project. The subsequent design work will determine the most effective and feasible retrofit method for implementation at Berkeley Municipal Pier.

## 5.3 Corrosion Evaluation

The deterioration of concrete structures is primarily a function of the corrosion of the reinforcing steel. As the reinforcing steel corrodes, corrosion products generated occupy a volume of approximately four to seven times that of the parent steel. Tension is induced within the concrete as the corrosion products build which causes it to crack and delaminate at the reinforcing level.

Corrosion of steel reinforcement is the paramount failure mechanism for waterfront marine structures such as the Municipal Pier. Replacement can be the preferred alternative in cases where damage is extensive. Corrosion activity manifests itself through the appearance of cracks, spalling, and delamination and given sufficient time, can result in a reduction in structural capacity. Concrete is by its nature a porous material and is vulnerable to cracking due to thermal movements, shrinkage and moisture intrusion. Water, oxygen and chlorides can reach the steel reinforcing and cause damage by corrosion. Mitigation and repair methods are typically performed using low shrinkage cementitious repair materials, proper concrete cover and correct surface preparation and placement techniques that result in durable repairs.

Deterioration of concrete due to corrosion results in cracking because the products of corrosion (rust scale) occupy a greater volume than the original steel reinforcing and exert substantial stresses on the surrounding concrete. The observable manifestations of corrosion at the pier include staining, cracking and spalling of the concrete structural members.

Reinforcing steel corrosion is typically very active in the wave splash zone for marine structures and in curbs, railing and decks where concrete cover may be insufficient. In addition, the water-cement (w/c) ratio of the original concrete mix design has significant importance for the durability of the concrete. A higher w/c ratio would result in greater permeability of the concrete, allowing a pathway for moisture to enter the structural member and react with the reinforcing steel, causing the damage observed.

## 6. Conceptual Pier Rehabilitation Alternatives

## 6.1 Pile Repairs

#### 6.1.1 Repair Methodology

The basic methodology for design of repairs to the pier structure consists of providing sufficient capacity for the existing structural elements to meet the current building code requirements for vertical area loading on a public access structure. The conceptual repairs will attempt to slow the rate of the ongoing deterioration of the reinforced concrete to the extent economically feasible. The conceptual structural repairs are considered maintenance and serve to restore the structural capacity for a public access structure and to extend the service life of the pier. The methods and type of repair designs reviewed were derived from damage observed during the course of the field surveys and review of the record documents.

A method to contain the debris during repair construction will be required as part of the project specifications for the repair work. Present environmental requirements maintain that loose concrete debris and other construction and demolition materials shall not fall in the water.

Conceptual seismic retrofit designs were evaluated in this study. This report provides an evaluation of strengthening schemes to provide an increase in the pier's capacity to resist lateral loads.

In the case of Municipal Pier, where the damage observed is due extensive deterioration, it may prove economical to replace all or part of the structure rather than performing extensive repairs. This option is discussed in greater detail below.

#### 6.1.2 Pile Damage at Bent Cap

This repair utilizes fiber-reinforced shotcrete for the repair of the piles in locations with spalled concrete and exposed reinforcing steel in sections above the waterline. Shotcrete is defined as the application of mortar using a pneumatic method. The shotcrete can be applied using the wet or dry method where the material is blown into position using compressed air. This method has the disadvantage of only being able to be used on surfaces above low water. This limitation includes the impact of tides and obviously reduces the amount of time available for construction.

The concrete surface is prepared by chipping and hydroblasting the loose and unsound concrete and removing concrete from around the reinforcing steel. The steel is then cleaned of rust and scale and coated with a zinc-rich coating. The concrete surfaces are coated with an epoxy resin bonding agent and shotcrete is applied. Proper curing methods are then used to ensure that excessive shrinkage does not occur in the repair area. A sketch of the conceptual repair is shown on Figure 6-1 below.



#### Figure 6-1: Pile Repair at Bent Cap

#### 6.1.3 Pile Damage Repairs

An alternative for repair of the piles with extensive damage by exposure to the seawater and floating debris in the splash zone is the use of preformed, grout-filled fiberglass jackets. This repair has been used extensively for the repair of timber, steel and concrete piles that have suffered damage and deterioration and is well-suited for marine construction. The fiberglass jacket will extend above and below the high and low waterlines to cover the splash zone.

Work can be accomplished from floating or fixed platforms under the pier. The concrete pile surface is prepared using a hydropneumatic method for removing marine growth from the pile. The jackets are placed in position on the piles using spacers and reinforcing is placed if required. Cementitious grout is then pumped into place in the annulus through ports in the shell, bonding with the existing concrete and preventing further deterioration of the section. The fiberglass jackets remain in place on the piles and offer abrasion resistance and provide a longer service life than many of the options below. A sketch of this repair detail is shown below in Figure 6-2.



Figure 6-2: Fiberglass (FRP) Pile Jacket

## 6.2 Structural Concrete Repairs

#### 6.2.1 Bent Cap Repairs

The reinforced concrete beams and bent caps have suffered extensive damage along the bottom and sides of the section due to delamination of the concrete cover and corrosion of the reinforcing steel.

The recommended repair consists of the use of fiber-reinforced shotcrete applied to form a built-up section and provide encasement for the reinforcing bars. The synthetic fibers are added to the shotcrete mix and have the benefit of reducing shrinkage of the repair material which is important in the marine environment. The spalled and loose concrete is first removed and the exposed steel is cleaned of rust and scale and an epoxy coating is applied to protect the reinforcing and increase bonding for the shotcrete.

Replacement of the existing reinforcing bars will be required if damage due to corrosion is extensive. The new sections of reinforcing bars may be lapped with the existing steel or mechanical couplers may be used. A bonding agent is spray-applied to the concrete surface and galvanized steel mesh or fabric is then attached to the concrete and the shotcrete applied. A sketch of the shotcrete beam repair detail can be seen below in Figure 6-3 below.



#### Figure 6-3: Typical Bent Cap Repair

#### 6.2.2 Deck Slab Repairs

#### **Deck Slab Repairs**

The concrete is missing or spalled at many locations on the underside of the deck slab. This is damage commonly seen as the concrete forms tensile cracks over time due to shrinkage of the concrete or sustained loading. This provides a path for moisture from the marine environment allowing for a reaction with the reinforcing steel. As the steel rusts, the corrosion expands and occupies a volume greater than the original steel. This expansion creates the spalled condition observed.

The repair will consist of removing the spalled concrete and chipping away the concrete surrounding the existing reinforcing. The reinforcing will be cleaned to remove the rust and scale and then coated as described above. If the reinforcing is found to have deteriorated to the point where a significant percentage of the original section has been lost, additional reinforcing will be doweled into the concrete and spliced with the existing steel. Alternatively, the damaged reinforcing may be cut out and a new section attached using mechanical connectors. The new reinforcing may be of a smaller diameter with less spacing to reduce the lap lengths required. The prepared area will then be patched with an epoxy mortar or grout suitable for the overhead application or a shotcrete method will be utilized.

A sketch of the shotcrete deck slab repair detail can be seen on Figure 6-4.



#### Figure 6-4: Deck Slab Repair

#### 6.2.3 Deck Topping Repairs

The deck topping would receive a similar repair. The damaged area would be sawcut and then chipped out to expose the sound concrete. The reinforcing steel would be blasted clean and repaired if required. The area would then be filled with a self-leveling epoxy grout and a smooth finish applied using floats.

#### 6.2.4 Concrete Crack Repairs

Concrete cracking not caused by corrosion of reinforcing steel can be repaired by an epoxy injection method. Treating corrosion-induced cracks with a pressure-injected epoxy will not stop the corrosion process and new cracks will continue to form. See Figure 6-5.

CONCRETE CRACK REPAIR NOTES:

- SEE STRUCTURAL REPAIR PLANS FOR LOCATIONS AND ESTIMATED LENGTHS OF CRACKS TO BE REPAIRED. CRACKS EXCEEDING 1/16-INCH IN WIDTH SHALL BE REPAIRED.
- LIGHTLY TAP THE EXISTING CONCRETE ADJACENT TO THE CRACK. IF THE CONCRETE SOUNDS "HOLLOW" OR IF CRACK WIDTH EXCEEDS 1/4-INCH AT ANY LOCATION, CHIP OFF THE SURFACE AND ANY DELAMINATED CONCRETE AND REPAIR AS A SPALL; OTHERWISE, PROCEED TO STEP 3 BELOW.
- 3. CLEAN THE EXISTING CONCRETE SURFACE ALONG THE CRACK OF ALL LOOSE BOND INHIBITING AND OTHER DELETERIOUS MATERIALS, INCLUDING ANY EXISTING CRACK SEALANT, BY MECHANICAL MEANS. SEAL THE CRACK WITH THE SURFACE CAP SEALANT (SEE SPECIFICATIONS) AND INSTALL THE PRESSURE INJECTION PORTS OVER THE CRACK AT A MAXIMUM INTERVAL OF 12-INCHES ON CENTERS. ENSURE CAP SEALANT COMPLETELY BRIDGES THE CRACK.
- 4. WITH STEADY PRESSURE, INJECT THE EPOXY (SEE SPECIFICATIONS) BEGINNING WITH THE INJECTION PORT AT ONE END OF THE CRACK (BOTTOM OF THE CRACK FOR VERTICAL CRACKS). WHEN EPOXY EMERGES FROM THE NEXT ADJACENT PORT, MOVE TO THE NEXT ADJACENT PORT AND CONTINUE WITH THE EPOXY INJECTION.
- AFTER THE EPOXY HAS CURED, REMOVE THE INJECTION PORTS AND CAP SEALANT.
- FINISH CONCRETE SURFACE TO MATCH EXISTING AND APPLY CONCRETE SEALER (SEE SPECIFICATIONS).

CONCRETE PATCH REPAIR PROCEDURE:

- REMOVE ALL UNSOUND OR DELAMINATED CONCRETE, PROVIDING A MINIMUM OF 1/4-INCH SUBSTRATE PROFILE AND 3/4-INCH CLEARANCE BEHIND CORRODED REINFORCING STEEL.
- 2. REMOVE RUST AND SCALE FROM REINFORCING STEEL.
- SAW CUT THE PERIMETER OF THE AREA IDENTIFIED FOR REPAIR TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 1/4-INCH TO PREVENT FEATHER EDGES. DO NOT CUT EXISTING STEEL REINFORCEMENT.
- 4. CHIP AND REMOVE ALL LOOSE AND DETERIORATED CONCRETE TO 3/4-INCH MINIMUM BEHIND EXPOSED REINFORCING STEEL. CARE SHALL BE TAKEN TO NOT DAMAGE THE EXISTING REBAR DURING THE DEMOLITION PROCESS.
- WATER/SAND BLAST EXPOSED CONCRETE SURFACE AND EXPOSED REINFORCING STEEL TO REMOVE ALL CONTAMINANTS AND RUST.
- APPLY ONE COAT OF SIKA ARMATEC 110 BONDING AGENT (OR APPROVED EQUAL) TO STEEL AND SURROUNDING CONCRETE TO INHIBIT CORROSION.
- 7. PRE-WET CONCRETE SURFACE TO A SATURATED SURFACE-DRY CONDITION (SSD).
- 8. PLACE POLYMER-MODIFIED, CEMENTITOUS NON-SAG MORTAR WITH CORROSION INHIBITOR TO REPAIR AREAS.
- UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE ON REPAIR DETAILS, CHIP OUT AREAS SHALL EXTEND A MINIMUM 3-INCHES BEYOND SPALL SIZE AS INDICATED ON THE REPAIR SCHEDULE.



#### Figure 6-5: Typical Concrete Crack Repair

#### 6.2.5 Construction Methods

The under deck construction repair will likely occur using work floats or fixed platforms secured to the piles under the deck. Equipment and materials can be supported using this method and the work may be performed from the floats. Barges could also be used to provide the contractor with a staging area to avoid impacting public access on the deck walkway. The work barges could be held in position adjacent to the pier using guide piles.

The repair design specifications developed will address the requirement for the contractor to provide a viable containment plan as a means of capturing all concrete and other materials during the demolition and construction process. This plan may consist of the use of a work platform with mesh curtains enclosing the work area. The specifications developed for the project would typically require a containment plan to be submitted by the contractor to contain the debris during demolition and preparation of the concrete surfaces and shotcrete during application.

#### 6.2.6 Above Deck Repairs

Above the deck, these repair items are not structural and would not impact the stability of the pier structure. Based on our observations, the most time-sensitive repairs are related to the safety of the public.

#### Timber Guard Railing

While the timber guard railing is generally in good condition, many of the original timber railing components exhibit signs of rotting and cracking. From our observation, repairs are not an immediate concern but should be monitored for further deterioration that would compromise safety. Per the District's general practice, the guard railing will be repaired using Alaskan Yellow Cedar.

#### **Benches**

Most of the benches are observed to be heavily deteriorated with missing bench planks. Replace benches with similar precast concrete benches or vandal-resistant wind shelters.

#### Fish Cleaning Station

The concrete surface of the sink is cracked and pitted and the piping is rusted and corroded. We recommend resurfacing the concrete and replacement of the pipes and faucet.

## 6.3 Pier Rehabilitation, Retrofit and Replacement Alternatives

GHD reviewed several alternatives for rehabilitation, retrofit and replacement of Municipal Pier. Complete replacement of the pier was also investigated as part of the study.

The replacement concept would be to provide a durable, functional recreational pier with a high seismic performance level. The pier would be designed to remain undamaged for an earthquake that is anticipated to occur one or more times during the life of the structure.

The conceptual pier structure would consist of precast concrete or prefabricated steel / aluminum construction. Advantages to the precast concrete include an elimination of expensive formwork required for the over water construction. Other benefits include a denser, higher strength concrete that has improved quality control as it is cast in a plant rather than at the project site. The curing process can be controlled in a better manner than cast-in-place concrete and the tolerances for the reinforcing steel placement are improved over those in the field. These factors add up to a longer service life than traditional cast-in-place concrete construction. Connections for the precast piles, bent caps and deck planks can be also be made easily, allowing for less construction time.

The tables below summarize the pros and cons of each alternative.

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.
•	Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues	•	Inelastic failure of the piles can be expected at relatively low lateral displacement of the structure during a seismic event. The timber piles do not have adequate displacement capacity. <u>Damage to pier should be expected</u> <u>following a moderate to large earthquake</u> .
•	Environmental permitting is anticipated to be relatively straightforward. Work is	•	Following repairs, concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required

### Table 6-1: Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P1 - Concrete Repairs Only

considered deferred maintenance and in-water work is minimal		at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.
	•	Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than pier replacement alternatives.
	•	Initial construction cost is relatively expensive due to labor extensive repair work

# Table 6-2: Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P2 – Concrete Repairs/Lateral Stiffening (add piles)

Pros	Cons
Allows public use of recreational pier	• Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.
• Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues	• Inelastic failure of the piles can be expected at relatively low lateral displacement of the structure during a seismic event. The timber piles do not have adequate displacement capacity. Some damage to pier should be expected following a moderate to large earthquake.
Environmental permitting process and requirements will be more extensive due to addition of piles	• Following repairs, concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.
<ul> <li>Displacement capacity and resistance to earthquake damage is increased over Alternative P1</li> </ul>	• Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than pier replacement alternatives.
	Initial construction cost is relatively expensive due to labor extensive repair work

## Table 6-3: Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P3 – Concrete Repairs/Lightweight Deck

Pros	Cons
Allows public use of recreational pier	• Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.
• Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues	• Inelastic failure of the piles can be expected at relatively low lateral displacement of the structure during a seismic event. The timber piles do not have adequate displacement capacity. Damage to pier should be expected following a moderate to large earthquake.
<ul> <li>Environmental permitting process and requirements may be less extensive due to the reduced pier deck area</li> </ul>	• Following repairs, concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required

• Displacement capacity and resistance to earthquakes is increased slightly over Alternative P1. Seismic mass is decreased from previous alternatives due to lighter deck system.

 Concrete deterioration is reduced due to replacement using a lightweight deck system at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.

- Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than pier replacement alternatives.
- Pier width is reduced from 22 feet to 12 feet.



•

Table 6-4: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P4 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and moment frames)

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.

Figure 6-6: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P4 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and moment frames)

•	Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues	•	Very little damage to pier should be expected following a moderate to large earthquake.
•	Environmental permitting process and requirements will be more extensive due to addition of piles	•	Following repairs, concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.
•	Complete seismic retrofit, pier meets current building code	•	Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than pier replacement alternatives.
		٠	High construction cost due to concrete repairs, steel piles and framing



Figure 6-7: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P5 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles and pile bent frames)

Table 6-5: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit	Alternative P5 -	- Concrete	Repairs	/Seismic
Retrofit (add piles and pile	bent frames)			

Pros	Cons
Allows public use of recreational pier	<ul> <li>Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues</li> </ul>	• Very little damage to pier should be expected following a moderate to large earthquake.
Environmental permitting process and requirements will be more extensive due to addition of piles	• Following repairs, concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.

- Complete seismic retrofit, pier meets current building code
- Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than pier replacement alternatives.





Table 6-6: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P6 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles, moment frames and lightweight deck system)

Pros			Cons		
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.		
•	Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues	•	Inelastic failure of the piles can be expected at relatively low lateral displacement of the structure during a seismic event. The timber piles do not have adequate displacement capacity. Damage to pier should be expected following a moderate to large earthquake.		

•	Environmental permitting process and requirements will be more extensive due to addition of piles	•	Concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion following repairs is reduced from Alternatives P4 and P5 due to lightweight deck. Deterioration will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.
•	Complete seismic retrofit, pier meets current building code	•	Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than other alternatives



Figure 6-9: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P7 – Concrete Repairs /Seismic Retrofit (add piles, pile bent trusses and lightweight deck system)

# Table 6-7: Pier Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P7 – Concrete Repairs /SeismicRetrofit (add piles, pile bent trusses and lightweight deck system)

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Construction work will require a long schedule due to staging required and type of concrete repairs.
•	Repair work can be performed in stages allowing portions of the pier to be reopened while work continues	•	Inelastic failure of the piles can be expected at relatively low lateral displacement of the structure during a seismic event. The timber piles do not have adequate displacement capacity. Damage to pier should be expected following a moderate to large earthquake.
•	Environmental permitting process and requirements will be more extensive due to addition of piles	•	Concrete deterioration due to steel corrosion following repairs is reduced from Alternatives P4 and P5 due to lightweight deck. Deterioration will continue and inspections will be required at two to three year intervals to evaluate deterioration. Repairs will be required at relatively small intervals to allow structure to remain open for use.
•	Complete seismic retrofit, pier meets current building code	•	Longer term maintenance costs will be greater than other alternatives.



Figure 6-10: Pier Replacement Alternative P8 – Monopile Pier with Precast Deck

#### Table 6-8: Pier Replacement Alternative P8 – Monopile Pier with Precast Deck

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Requires demolition of existing pier structure
•	Pier meets current building code seismic requirements, very little damage should be expected during an earthquake	•	Appearance will be different from existing pier
•	Lower cost compared to other alternatives		
•	Environmental permitting may be easier than Alternatives P2 through P7 as area of pier is reduced from existing structure		
•	Long service life can be expected, inspection intervals can be greater than Alternatives P1 through P7		

- Pier deck can be raised from current elevation for higher water levels in the future
- Longer term maintenance costs will be less than other alternatives.
- Pier can be extended in future with additional funding
- Prefabricated elements will reduce construction schedule



Figure 6-11: Pier Replacement Alternative P9 – Monopile Pier with CIP Deck Table 6-9: Pier Replacement Alternative P9 – Monopile Pier with CIP Deck

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Requires demolition of existing pier structure
•	Pier meets current building code seismic requirements, very little damage should be expected during an earthquake	•	Appearance will be different from existing pier
•	Lower cost compared to other alternatives		

- Environmental permitting may be easier than Alternatives P2 through P7 as area of pier is reduced from existing structure
- Long service life can be expected, inspection intervals can be greater than Alternatives P1 through P7
- Pier deck can be raised from current elevation for higher water levels in the future
- Longer term maintenance costs will be less than other alternatives.
- Pier can be extended in future with additional funding
- Prefabricated elements will reduce construction schedule



Figure 6-12: Pier Replacement Alternative P10 – Precast Concrete Construction

### Table 6-10: Pier Replacement Alternative P10 – Precast Concrete Construction

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	• F	Requires demolition of existing pier structure
•	Pier meets current building code seismic requirements, very little damage should be expected during an earthquake	• A e A	ppearance will be somewhat different from xisting pier, closer to original appearance than Iternatives P8, P9 and P11
•	Lower cost compared to other alternatives		
•	Environmental permitting may be easier than Alternatives P2 through P7 as area of pier is reduced from existing structure		
•	Long service life can be expected, inspection intervals can be greater than Alternatives P1 through P7		
•	Pier deck can be raised from current elevation for higher water levels in the future		
•	Longer term maintenance costs will be less than other alternatives.		
•	Pier can be extended in future with additional funding		
•	Prefabricated elements will reduce construction schedule		

## Table 6-11: Pier Replacement Alternative P11 – Monopile Pier with Prefabricated Steel Bents Caps and Aluminum Truss Deck System

	Pros		Cons
•	Allows public use of recreational pier	•	Requires demolition of existing pier structure
•	Pier meets current building code seismic requirements, very little damage should be expected during an earthquake	•	Appearance will be different from existing pier
•	Lower cost compared to other alternatives		
•	Environmental permitting may be easier than Alternatives P2 through P7 as area of pier is reduced from existing structure. Deck grating will allow sunlight to pass through		
•	Long service life can be expected, inspection intervals can be greater than Alternatives P1 through P7		

•	Pier deck can be raised from current elevation for higher water levels in the future	
•	Longer term maintenance costs will be less than other alternatives.	
•	Pier can be extended in future with additional funding	
•	Prefabricated elements will reduce construction schedule	

## 7. Project Permitting Considerations

In general, each of the three alternatives would require coordination with the same regulatory authorities. Table 7-1 provides a summary of the permit requirements. The level of effort and time necessary to obtain permits when comparing the three alternatives would be lowest for the pile repairs, moderate for the structural concrete repairs, and greatest for the pier rehabilitation, retrofit and replacement alternative. Effort and time considerations correlate directly with the potential cost to complete the permit process. The information provided in this section is intended as a preliminary assessment; final permit requirements would be obtained during coordination with each regulatory authority once an alternative is chosen and preliminary design is underway. Construction generally cannot begin until all regulatory authorizations have been obtained.

Authorization and/or Coordination Statute	Regulatory Authority with Jurisdiction	Trigger	Approach
General or Individual Permit: Section 404, Clean Water Act Section 10, Rivers and Harbor Act	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco District	Section 404 regulates discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Section 10 regulates placement of structures in navigable waters of the U.S.	Early coordination with USACE through a pre-application meeting would direct the most appropriate permit strategy. It is anticipated that the pile repairs and structural concrete repairs alternatives would qualify for approval under a general nationwide permit, while the pier rehabilitation, retrofit, and replacement alternative may require an individual permit.
State Historic Preservation Officer Concurrence: Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act	California Office of Historic Preservation	The USACE cannot permit an activity that may affect properties listed, or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places without the appropriate review as well as avoidance	The California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Northwest Information Center would be contacted early in the preliminary design process to determine the potential for nearby cultural resources.

#### Table 7-1: Summary of Potential Permit Requirements

Authorization and/or Coordination Statute	Regulatory Authority with Jurisdiction	Trigger	Approach
		and minimization measures.	
Biological Opinion (BO): Section 7, Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) Magnuson- Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Marine Mammal Protection Act Migratory Bird Protection Act	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries	If the USACE determines that a project may result in the take of a federally-listed species, approval would be required under Section 7 of the FESA. Fisheries, marine mammals, and migratory birds are further protected from project impacts under their respective statutes.	A Biological Resource Report would be prepared during the initial stages of the project to determine the potential for impact to specific species and recommend avoidance and minimization measures. A Biological Assessment for federally-listed species and essential fish habitat would then be prepared and submitted to USFWS and NOAA Fisheries for review. Alternatives with smaller scale construction would generally have less impact on sensitive species and may only require informal consultation resulting in agency concurrence that the project is not likely to adversely affect listed species. Total pier replacement is anticipated to require formal consultation with issuance of a BO.
Water Quality Certification: Section 401, Clean Water Act	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	An activity which may result in a discharge into a water body must request state certification that the proposed activity will not violate state and federal water quality standards.	Early coordination with the San Francisco Bay RWQCB during the preliminary design phase would allow for vetting of potential issues regardless of chosen alternative.
Incidental Take Permit: Section 2081 subdivision (b) of the California Fish and Game Code	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	CDFW may issue incidental take permits for any species listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) when there is a potential for impact to those species from an activity requiring a discretionary permit or approval by a public agency.	A consistency determination is anticipated to be required for smaller scale alternatives. The total pier replacement alternative is anticipated to require a mitigation plan to address state- listed species and an incidental take permit for species that would be initially assessed in the Biological Resources Report.

Authorization and/or Coordination Statute	Regulatory Authority with Jurisdiction	Trigger	Approach
Major or Administrative Permit	Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC)	Any activities that involves filing, dredging and dredged sediment disposal, and work on land within 100 feet of the San Francisco Bay shoreline.	It is anticipated that the pile repairs and structural concrete repairs may qualify for an administrative permit, but the pier replacement would be considered a major permit action. Early coordination with the BCDC would determine the level of effort required to complete their process.
Other	U.S. Coast Guard, County, or City Planning and Public Works	The U.S. Coast Guard may comment on the project, as the pier is located within a navigation channel. Also, local permit requirements for actions such as demolition and sampling would need to be satisfied.	Early coordination with stakeholders during preliminary design stages once an alternative is chosen would allow potential issues to be vetted and appropriate authorizations to be obtained.

It should be noted that the San Francisco Bay Area Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) can be used for projects involving several regulatory agencies. However, each agency would still require submittal of appropriate information to satisfy their individual regulatory requirements. Therefore, the JARPA is not considered to be a more efficient permit method at this time and is not discussed further.

## 7.1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA; 33 USC 1251-1376). The USACE regulations implementing Section 404 define waters of the U.S. to include intrastate waters (such as, lakes, rivers, streams, wetlands, and natural ponds) that the use, degradation, or destruction of could affect interstate or foreign commerce. Wetlands are defined for regulatory purposes as "areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions" (33 CFR 328.3; 40 CFR 230.3). The placement of structures in navigable waters of the U.S. is also regulated by the USACE under Section 10 of the Federal Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC 401 et seq.). Projects are approved by the USACE under general (i.e., nationwide, programmatic, or regional) or standard (i.e., individual) permits. The type of permit is determined by the USACE and based on project parameters.

Applicants can typically expect a Section 404 permit to be issued within six months to 1.5 years after the USACE acknowledges receipt of a complete permit package, including a compensation plan for mitigation of loss to wetlands and water resources as appropriate. This timeline depends greatly on consultation with other agencies (i.e., State Historic Preservation Officer and U.S. Fish

and Wildlife Service [USFWS] or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] Fisheries). Nationwide or regional general permits usually have a timeline on the shorter end of the spectrum, whereas individual permits are the longest to approve.

There is a nationwide permit for maintenance, which includes repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of any previously authorized, currently serviceable structure, that may be acceptable for the pile or structural concrete repairs alternatives. The total pier replacement may require an individual permit. In addition to the nationwide or individual permit requirement, if dredging and disposal of dredged sediments is involved with any alternative, a consolidated dredging and dredged material reuse/disposal application with sediment sampling plan, and sediment quality sampling would be required and processed through the Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO).

#### 7.1.1 Section 106 Consultation

USACE permittees must prove compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which stipulates that no permitted activity may affect properties listed, or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Typically, the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Information Centers would be contacted regarding cultural resources within the project area. Then, further study may be required by a cultural resource specialist. The USACE may also receive approval of the project form the State Historic Preservation Officer.

The Northwest Information Center would be contacted shortly after project initiation to determine the potential for sensitive cultural resources under Section 106 to be a concern for any of the alternatives.

#### 7.1.2 Section 7 Consultation

Pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), an federal agency, such as the USACE, reviewing a proposed project within its jurisdiction must determine whether any federally-listed or proposed species may be present in the project region, and whether the proposed project would result in a take of such species. The FESA prohibits take of a single threatened and endangered species except under certain circumstances and only with authorization from the USFWS or the NOAA Fisheries through a permit under Section 7 (for federal entities) of the Act. Take under the FESA includes activities such as "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." The USFWS regulations define harm to include "significant habitat modification or degradation." On June 29, 1995, a U.S. Supreme Court ruling further defined harm to include habitat modification "...where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering."

The federal agency is also required to determine whether the project is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species proposed to be listed under the FESA, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for such species (16 USC 1536[3][4]). If it is determined that a project may result in the take of a federally-listed species, authorization would be required under Section 7 of the FESA.

During the Section 7 consultation, in-water construction activities for either alternative may be limited to a work window that NOAA Fisheries agrees would avoid impacts to FESA-listed fish spawning and migration seasons. An Incidental Harassment Authorization from NOAA Fisheries may also be required for pile driving and dredging activities to ensure appropriate minimization measures are enacted to reduce potential impacts to marine mammals.

Furthermore, the project may require consideration of essential fish habitat (EFH) under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which requires federal agencies to consult with NOAA Fisheries about any action that may adversely affect EFH or federally managed commercial fish species. Eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) is a native marine vascular plant indigenous to the soft-bottom shallow bays and estuaries of the San Francisco and San Pablo Bays. An eelgrass survey would be required for any of the alternatives per the Draft California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy and further coordination and conservation measures enacted based on the survey results.

The USFWS and NOAA Fisheries has a 135 day total timeline for Section 7 FESA consultations that begins once a complete Biological Assessment is received by the agency. More complex projects may require more time to review and receive agency approval.

## 7.2 Regional Water Quality Control Board

Section 401 of the CWA requires any applicant for a federal license or permit, which involves an activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the U.S., obtain a certification that the discharge will comply with applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards. CWA 401 water quality certifications are issued by Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) under the California Environmental Protection Agency.

The RWQCB has 30 days (from receipt) to determine whether an application is complete. Once an application is deemed complete, the board then generally has 60 days to issue or deny the 401 Water Quality Certification or to request additional review time. Time extensions can be granted for up to one year, however, this is not a typical occurrence.

Early coordination with the San Francisco Bay RWQCB regardless of the chosen alternative would allow for vetting of potential concerns and a more efficient receipt of the certification.

## 7.3 California Department of Fish & Wildlife

Section 2081 subdivision (b) of the California Fish and Game Code allows California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to issue incidental take permits for any species listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as endangered, threatened, or candidate as long as the following applies:

- The authorized take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity;
- The impacts of the authorized take are minimized and fully mitigated, typically by development and CDFW acceptance of a mitigation plan (or possibly a Habitat Conservation Plan for more complex projects);
- The mitigation plan includes measures to minimize and fully mitigate the impacts of authorized take that are (a) somewhat proportional to the proposed impact; (b) maintain the project objectives to the greatest extent possible; and (c) have a reasonable assurance of successful implementation;
- Adequate finding is available to fulfill measures outlined in the mitigation plan and incidental take permit; and
- Issuance of an incidental take permit will not jeopardize the continued existence of a species listed under the CESA. Also, the take of a fully protected species and birds specified in the Fish and Game Code cannot be authorized with a permit. Projects must be designed to avoid impacts to these species where they occur.

The CDFW has 30 days to inform an applicant of an incidental take permit that the application is complete or additional information is required. A draft of the permit is typically prepared and issued within 185 days after the application is deemed complete.

If a species to be impacted is both federally- and state-listed, the CDFW will provide a consistency determination with the USFWS findings from the Section 7 consultation. The determination is generally completed within 30 days of receipt of the request by CDFW.

A Biological Resources Report would be prepared following initiation of the project to determine the potential for impact to sensitive species from the chosen alternative as well as the necessity for an individual take permit and/or consistency determination. Plant and wildlife species in the vicinity of the pier that would be considered in the report are shown in Figure 7-1 and Figure 7-2.



#### Figure 7-1: CNDDB 5-Mile Radius Plant Occurrences


### Figure 7-2: CNDDB 5-Mile Radius Wildlife Occurrences

## 7.4 Bay Conservation Development Commission

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has permit approval authority over activities that involve filing, dredging and dredged sediment disposal, and work on land within 100 feet of the San Francisco Bay shoreline. In addition, the BCDC has authority under the Coastal Zone Management Act to review federal projects (i.e. those requiring federal approval or are supported with federal funds).

The BCDC Design Review Board will generally review a project during preliminary design stages prior to the submittal of an application to ensure public access (both physical and visual) is well designed, useful, and attractive. The BCDC Engineering Criteria Review Board also reviews the engineering aspects of projects at their discretion. Typically, major projects involving fill in the Bay require ECRB review, while other smaller projects may warrant review if unusual engineering or geological factors are involved.

The BCDC has 30 days upon receipt of an application to determine whether the application is complete and notify the applicant about any deficiencies. The application, once complete, will then be processed as a Major, Administrative, or Regionwide permit depending on the type of work to be authorized. The BCDC generally has 90 days (unless the applicant agrees to a longer review period) to act on a project once an application is deemed complete.

Regionwide permits refer to routine maintenance that qualify for approval under an existing regionwide program. This type of permit is not anticipated to apply to any of the pier alternatives.

Administrative permits are applicable to minor repairs and improvements. Therefore, approval can be obtained without a public hearing. The average timeframe to obtain an administrative permit is between 45 to 60 days after a complete application has been accepted by BCDC. The pile and structural concrete repairs alternatives may qualify for an administrative permit.

Major permits are issued for projects that have a scope beyond a minor repair or improvement. A public hearing is mandatory for these projects and the application typically may also be reviewed by the Design Review Board and ECRB. If the time for multiple reviews and the public hearing is considered, major permits generally take longer than 90 days to receive once a complete application has been accepted by the BCDC. The pier rehabilitation, retrofit, and replacement alternative may require a major permit.

A final permit, regardless of type, is not considered complete until a signed version showing agreement with permit conditions has been provided to the BCDC.

# 8. Cost Estimates for Pier Repair and Rehabilitation Alternatives

Rough order of magnitude construction cost estimates have been prepared for the pier structural rehabilitation, retrofit and replacement concepts. Unit costs were developed based on relevant experience and knowledge, historical cost information, recent bid history of similar waterfront projects, vendor quotes from recent projects for similar items where applicable, recent Contractor quotes for similar items where applicable and discussion with marine construction contractors.

The cost estimates include topside repairs and improvements to the pier in addition to the structural repairs.

For Alternative P1, a large cost item are the concrete repairs required at the pier substructure, primarily to address the large amount of concrete deterioration at the deck panels. This is due to the extensive spalling and deterioration of the existing concrete sections. The estimates provided use a placed mortar method of repair for the deck panel and bent cap concrete damage. Alternative P2 includes the addition of a single pile at each pile bent to increase the lateral stiffness of the pier, reducing displacement demand on the timber piles. These alternatives do not represent a seismic retrofit per the Building Code.

Alternatives P4 through P7 represent a complete seismic retrofit of the existing pier structure in addition to the concrete repairs. The pier structure will be strengthened to prevent collapse during the 975-year return period seismic event as described in Section 5. In this retrofit scenario, the pier may suffer repairable damage, which may be acceptable from a life safety standpoint given that the pier is only rarely occupied by large crowds.

Alternatives P8 through P11 include demolition of the existing 3000 lineal foot pier structure and construction of a new pier structure.

A summary of the alternatives and estimated costs is provided in Table 8-1 below.

Alternative	Description	Estimated Cost
P1	Rehabilitate Only (concrete repairs/replace deck panels)	\$27.73M
P2	Rehabilitate/Limited Lateral Strengthening (concrete repairs, add steel piles)	\$33.95M
P3	Rehabilitate/Replace Deck (repair existing piles and bent caps, add lightweight deck)	\$15.46M
P4	Rehabilitate/Retrofit (add piles with steel moment frames)	\$50.98M
P5	Rehabilitate/Retrofit (add cantilever piles with pile bent trusses)	\$43.12M
P6	Rehabilitate/Retrofit (add piles, steel moment frames and lightweight deck system)	\$33.93M
P7	Rehabilitate/Retrofit (add piles, pile bent	\$28.82M

### Table 8-1: Estimated Costs for Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Estimated Cost
	trusses and lightweight deck system)	
P8	Replacement (steel monopiles with precast bent cap and concrete deck)	\$19.82M
P9	Replacement (steel monopiles with CIP concrete deck)	\$20.65M
P10	Replacement (Precast concrete piles with precast deck)	\$20.92M
P11	Replacement (steel monopiles with steel bent caps and lightweight deck)	\$19.80M

An option to be considered is design and construction of a reduced length pier structure is funding becomes available. Figure 8-1 shows the estimated cost of Alternative P10 plotted against different pier lengths. The pier length can be increased in a later phase when additional funding is available.



Figure 8-1: Replacement Pier Length versus Estimated Cost

9.

# Summary and Recommendations for Pier Rehabilitation

The reinforced concrete panels comprising the pier deck have suffered extensive deterioration as the result of lost concrete cover and corrosion of the reinforcing bars. In many locations, the deck section structural capacity has been greatly reduced as the result of the deteriorated concrete and steel reinforcement to the point where it is no longer safe for public use. Extensive repairs are required to the pier to allow public use and extend the service life of the pier for its intended use.

An alternatives ranking analysis was performed on the rehabilitation, retrofit and replacement concepts reviewed during the study. Parameters used in the analysis include estimated cost, construction schedule, environmental permitting, technical feasibility, maintenance/service life, seismic vulnerability, historic appearance and climate change adaptation. The parameters were each given a weighting based on an assumed importance. Results of the analysis show that demolition of the existing pier and construction of a new structure obtain the highest ranking. This is the result of having a lower estimated cost, reduced construction schedule, longer service life and achieving improved seismic performance. The pier deck can also be designed at a higher elevation, providing adaptability for higher sea levels in the future.

The weighted parameters and rankings are shown on Table 9-1 below. The rankings are shown plotted again estimated cost on Figure 9-1.

						MUNICIPAL PIER.	ALTERNATIVES					
Parameter	Weighting Factor (%)	Ы	P2	64	bđ	54	96	67	BB	64	610	I (d
		Rehobilitate Only (concrete tepairs/replace deck panek)	Rehabilitate/ Lateral Strengthening (concrete repairs, add 24" dia, steel piles)	Rehabilitate/Replace Deck (repart existing plas and bent caps, add lightweight deck)	Rehabilitate/Aetrofit (add 24" dia. piles with steel moment frames)	Rehobilitate/Retrofit (add 48° dia contilever pile with pile bent trusses)	Rehobilitate/Retrofit (add 18" dia, piles. steel moment frames and fightweight deck system)	Rehobilitate/Retrofit (add 36" piles, pile Dent trusse and lightweight deck system)	Replacement (30° dia. monopiles with precast concrete deck)	Replacement (30° dha: manapiles with CIP concrete deck)	Replacement (24" oct. Precast concrete piles with precast deck)	Replacement (30" dia. steel monopiles with steel bent caps, lightweight deck )
Estimated Cost	35.00%	\$27,730,000 65.46%	\$33,945,000 47.96%	\$15,460,000 100.00%	\$50,980,000 0,00%	\$43,120,000 22,13%	\$33,925,000 48.02%	\$28,824,000 62.38%	\$19,815,000 87.74%	\$20,650,000 85.39%	\$20,920,000 84,63%	\$19,801,000 87.78%
Construction Schedule	15.00%	60.00%	50.00%	65.00%	55.00%	60.00%	55.00%	55.00%	%00'06	75.00%	80.00%	%00'06
Environmental/P ermitting	15.00%	100.00%	90.00%	30,00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	50.00%	50.00%	45.00%	55.00%
Technical Feasibility(1)	5.00%	80.00%	75.00%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Maintenance / Service Life	10.00%	50.00%	50.00%	65.00%	55.00%	55.00%	65.00%	65.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Historic Appearance	5.00%	100.00%	90.00%	65.00%	70.00%	70.00%	65.00%	65.00%	40.00%	40.00%	45.00%	40.00%
Seismic Vulnerability	10.00%	10.00%	30,00%	20.00%	90,00%	800.00%	90.00%	%00.06	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Climate Change Adaptation	5.00%	40.00%	40.00%	85.00%	40.00%	40.00%	95.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total Rating	100.00%	15	42	65	36	43	52	56	61	76	76	80

## Table 9-1: Alternative Rankings Table



### Figure 9-1: Alternative Rankings Graphic

From the results of the analysis, we recommend that the City consider the replacement pier alternatives which meets all of the required parameters while providing a safe, recreational and viewing opportunity for the public.

# 10. Grant Funding Opportunities

## 10.1 Grant Programs

Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant program:

This unique program rewards innovative thinking and collaborative solutions to difficult and sometimes dangerous transportation problems. A great TIGER program doesn't just improve transportation; it expands economic opportunity and transforms a community. The TIGER grant program supports innovative projects, including multi-modal and multi-jurisdictional projects, which are difficult to fund through traditional federal programs. In FY 2016 \$500 million in TIGER Grants were awarded to 40 entities by the Federal Department of Transportation, including multiple port projects. This program has an annual solicitation, typically announced in February and typically requiring a 20% match in urban areas with a maximum grant amount of \$100 million.

## 10.2 California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR)

CDPR has several recreational funding opportunities that may align with recreational components of the City's pier project. These funding sources include:

• Land and Water Conservation Fund Program, supported by funds from the National Park Service

• Habitat Conservation Fund grant program which allocates approximately \$2 million each year to cities, counties, and districts through the Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS). This

program requires a 50% match from grantees. Eligible projects include nature interpretation programs to bring urban residents into park and wildlife areas, protection of various plant and animal species, and acquisition and development of wildlife corridors and trails.

• Recreational Trails Program, funded through the Federal Highways Administration, which supports non-motorized trails projects. Project are required to have a 12% match and be listed on the State Transportation Improvement Plan.

## 10.3 Coastal Conservancy

The Coastal Conservancy has a variety of grant programs, some of which may align with the City's pier project to improve public access to the waterfront area and to revitalize working waterfronts. Project proposal should be coordinated with the appropriate regional conservancy staff. Project proposal are accepted on a continuous basis, with periodic grant rounds advertised and applications accepted for projects of a particular type or for specific locations.

## 10.4 Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)

The FHWA provides project funding through various program. The FHWA funding programs vary annually, and may be a source of funds for the City's pier project depending on the final configuration and project benefits. Potential programs that may be relevant include the Ferry Boat Discretionary Program and the Innovative Finance Program.

## 10.5 Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Similar to other agencies, the FTA facilitates multiple grant programs that may provide funds for some of the improvements the City is looking at for the pier. Potential programs include the Metropolitan & Statewide Planning and Non-Metropolitan Transportation Planning Grant Program, Passenger Ferry Grant Discretionary Program, and the Public Transportation Innovation Program.

# Appendix A

Engineer's Opinion of Preliminary Probable Construction Costs

#### TABLE 1 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P1

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Description - Dock Estension         Out Mot         Unit Cest         Total         Total         Total         Total         Total           Berterig Description - Dock Estension of Work         Berterig Municapi Pier - Rebabilization Alternative P1         Image: Comparison of Comparison	Project: Bei	keley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
Description Lock to Wittom         No         Unit         Math         Loor         Names Loo         Loor         Loor <thloor< th="">         Loor         Loor         &lt;</thloor<>		Description Deals Estantian	Qua	ntity	Unit C	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
Owners         Description         Owners         Owners <thowners< th=""> <thowners< th="">         Owne</thowners<></thowners<>		Description - Dock Extension	NO	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
Bertety Manapal Per - Matabalision Addramor P1         Image: Concrete and Oddr ropads w00x/ source rotrol         Image: Concrete and Oddr ropads w00x/ source rotrol           Mobilization / Demobilization         1         LS         \$3,997.283         \$3,997.2		General Description of Work								
- Perform concrete and other report without seaming from the point wit		Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation Alternative P1								
Mobilization / Demobilization         Image: https://www.net/image: https://wwww.net/image: https://www.net/image: https://wwww.		- Perform concrete and other repairs without seismic retrotit								
Image: Concent Spall Regards         Image: Concent Spall Regards <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>										
Nonlization / Demobilization         1         L         5         30/07.23         53.007         53.007.23         53.007         53.007.23         53.007         53.007.23         53.007         53.007.23         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007         53.007 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>										
Modulization / Demobilization         1         LS         \$3,967,263         \$3,972,00         \$3,972,00         \$3,972,00         \$3,972,0										
Pic Repairs         Dirichle         Dirichle         Dirichle         Dirichle         Dirichle         Dirichle           Concrete Spair Repairs         1,750         SF         \$36.00         \$214.00         \$63.000.00         \$27.00.00         \$225.00         \$437.500         \$255.00         \$437.500         \$255.00         \$437.500         \$255.00         \$437.500         \$255.00         \$437.500         \$255.00         \$247.500         \$255.00         \$247.500         \$255.00         \$347.500         \$250.00         \$247.600         \$250.00         \$247.600         \$250.00         \$247.600         \$220.00         \$247.600         \$220.00         \$247.600         \$220.00         \$247.600         \$220.00         \$247.600         \$252.00         \$37.47.500         \$372.00         \$57.00         \$57.60         <	-	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	IS		\$3,967,263		\$3,967,263	\$3 967 263	\$3 967 263
Pile Repairs         175         SF         58.00         521.00         537.450.00         525.00         537.450.00         525.00         547.500         555.500           Concrete Crack Repairs         5,120         LF         \$28.00         \$21.00.00         \$17.80.00         \$57.200.00         \$12.00         \$12.						<i><b>Q</b></i> <b>0</b> ,001,200		\$0,001,200	\$0,001,200	<i>\$0,001,200</i>
Concrete Spail Repairs         1,780         SF         38:00         58:12:00         58:30:00         54:27:00         55:27:00         54:27:00         55:27:00         54:27:00         55:27:00         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         55:70         57:00         55:70         57:00         55:70 </td <td></td> <td>Pile Repairs</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Pile Repairs								
Concrete Conck Repairs         5,120         LF         \$2200         \$3100.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$312.00.00         \$322.00         \$322.00		Concrete Spall Repairs	1.750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63,000,00	\$374,500.00	\$250.00	\$437,500
FRP Jacket Repair         25         EA         \$ \$350.00         \$ \$4,00.00         \$ \$110,000.00         \$ \$7,900.00         \$ \$110,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$240,000.00         \$ \$27,07.00         \$ \$ \$27.00         \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$		Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143,360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
Remove Battered Piles         120         EA         \$2,000,00         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$240,000,0         \$247,800,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,00,00         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,00,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,00,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,00,0         \$372,00         \$8,072,400,00,0         \$370,00,0         \$370,00,0         \$370,00,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$370,000,0         \$380,00         \$371,700,00,0         \$380,00         \$371,700,00,0         \$380,00         \$371,700,00,0         \$380,00         \$314,300,00,0         \$371,700,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00		FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
Pier Deck Slab Soffi         Image: Soffit Spall Repairs         21,700         SF         S38.00         S334.00         S524.600.00         S7.27.800         S372.00		Remove Battered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
Pier Deck Stab Softi         concrete Deck Softi Spall Repairs         21,700         SF         533.00         5324,600.00         572.70         S372.00										
Concrete Deck Softit Spail Repairs         21,700         SF         \$350.00         \$324,600         \$524,600.00         \$7247,800         \$327.200         \$82072,000           Pior Deck Slab - Above Deck         0         LB         \$0.05         \$1,75         \$570.00         \$475,000         \$27.70         \$570.00         \$27.70         \$51.050         \$27.70         \$51.050         \$27.70         \$51.050         \$27.70         \$51.050         \$27.70         \$51.050         \$570.00         \$570.00         \$550.00         \$570.00         \$570.00         \$57.00		Pier Deck Slab Soffit								
Reinforcement Allowance         600         LB         \$0.95         \$1.75         \$570.00         \$1,050.00         \$2.70         \$1.620           Pier Deck Slab - Above Deck		Concrete Deck Soffitt Spall Repairs	21,700	SF	\$38.00	\$334.00	\$824,600.00	\$7,247,800	\$372.00	\$8,072,400
Pier Deck Slab - Above Deck         Image: Slab - Above Deck         <		Reinforcement Allowance	600	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$570.00	\$1,050.00	\$2.70	\$1,620
Pier Deck Silbs - Above Deck										
Concrete Deck Spall Repairs         12,500         SF         \$18.00         \$225,000.00         \$750,000         \$56.00         \$700,00         \$270,000 <td></td> <td>Pier Deck Slab - Above Deck</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Pier Deck Slab - Above Deck								
Reinforcement Allowance         400         LB         \$0.95         \$17.5         \$380.00         \$700.00         \$2.70         \$1.00           Bent Caps         - <td></td> <td>Concrete Deck Spall Repairs</td> <td>12,500</td> <td>SF</td> <td>\$18.00</td> <td>\$38.00</td> <td>\$225,000.00</td> <td>\$475,000.00</td> <td>\$56.00</td> <td>\$700,000</td>		Concrete Deck Spall Repairs	12,500	SF	\$18.00	\$38.00	\$225,000.00	\$475,000.00	\$56.00	\$700,000
Bent Caps         Image: Concrete Spail Repairs         Image: Concrepairs         Image: Concrete Spail Repairs <td></td> <td>Reinforcement Allowance</td> <td>400</td> <td>LB</td> <td>\$0.95</td> <td>\$1.75</td> <td>\$380.00</td> <td>\$700.00</td> <td>\$2.70</td> <td>\$1,080</td>		Reinforcement Allowance	400	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$380.00	\$700.00	\$2.70	\$1,080
Bert Caps         Image: Concrete Spail Repairs         Image: Concrete Spail Repairs <thimage: concrete="" r<="" spail="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thimage:>										
Concrete Spail Repairs         1,600         SF         \$45.00         \$800.00.00         \$800.00.00         \$845.00         \$302.000           Concrete Crack Repairs         625         LF         \$32.00         \$280.375         \$325.00         \$327.000.00         \$184.375.00         \$327.00         \$328.075           Replace Deck Panels         100         LB         \$0.95         \$17.50         \$327.00         \$328.075           Replace Deck Panels         0.00         LB         \$14.00         \$12.00         \$433.864         \$371.712         \$26.00         \$360.03         \$14.00         \$12.00         \$433.864         \$371.712         \$26.00         \$360.00         \$14.80         \$360.00         \$11.20         \$433.864         \$371.712         \$26.00         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.40         \$360.00         \$11.400         \$360.00         \$11.400         \$360.00         \$11.400         \$360.00         \$11.400         \$360.00         \$11.400         \$360.00         \$11.400         \$360.00         \$11.400		Bent Caps								
Concrete Crack Repairs         625         LF         \$32.00         \$229.00         \$20.00.00         \$184.375.00         \$32.70         \$33.00         \$31.75         \$30.70         \$31.70         \$32.70         \$33.00         \$31.70         \$33.00         \$31.70         \$33.00         \$31.70         \$33.80         \$31.80         \$31.80         \$31.70         \$33.80         \$31.80         \$31.80         \$31.70         \$32.700         \$33.80         \$31.70		Concrete Spall Repairs	1,600	SF	\$45.00	\$600.00	\$72,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$645.00	\$1,032,000
Reinforcement Allowance         100         LB         \$0.95         \$1.75         \$95.00         \$177.00         \$2.70         \$270           Replace Deck Panels		Concrete Crack Repairs	625	LF	\$32.00	\$295.00	\$20,000.00	\$184,375.00	\$327.00	\$204,375
Replace Deck Panels		Reinforcement Allowance	100	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$95.00	\$175.00	\$2.70	\$270
Replace Deck Panels         30,976         SF         \$14.00         \$12.00         \$433,664         \$371,712         \$26.00         \$805,376           Replace Dreckst Concrete Deck Panels         30,976         SF         \$14.00         \$12.00         \$433,664         \$371,712         \$26.00         \$805,376           Above Deck  \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$<										
Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels         30.976         SF         \$14.00         \$12.00         \$433,664         \$371,712         \$26.00         \$805,376           Above Deck		Replace Deck Panels								
Above Deck         Image: Construction of the section of the sec		Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30,976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433,664	\$371,712	\$26.00	\$805,376
Above Deck         Image: Constraint of the state o										
Above Deck										
Repair Guardraling sections         450         LF         \$8.00         \$25.00         \$3.000         \$11,250.00         \$33.00         \$14,850           Light Poles and Fixtures         120         EA         \$105.00         \$85.00         \$5.440.00         \$4.420.00         \$9.880         \$5.400.00         \$11,250.00         \$8.420.00         \$9.880.00         \$9.880.00         \$9.880.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10,000.00         \$7.100.00         \$885.00         \$9.800.00         \$10.000.00         \$10.000.00         \$10.000.00         \$10.000.00         \$10.000.00         \$10.000.00         \$10.000.00         <		Above Deck								
Refurnish Deck Drains         52         EA         \$105.00         \$85.00         \$3,400.00         \$4,420.00         \$190.00         \$99.80           Light Poles and Fixtures         120         EA         \$5,600.00         \$1,500.00         \$672,000.00         \$100.00         \$7,100.00         \$852,000           Image: Construction of the second		Repair Guardrailing sections	450		\$8.00	\$25.00	\$3,600.00	\$11,250.00	\$33.00	\$14,850
Light Poles and Fixtures       120       EA       \$5,600.00       \$15,000.00       \$872,000.00       \$7,100.00       \$872,000.00       \$7,100.00       \$822,000         Image: Construction Application of the second		Refurbish Deck Drains	52	EA	\$105.00	\$85.00	\$5,460.00	\$4,420.00	\$190.00	\$9,880
Image: state of the s		Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
Image: state of the s										
Image: state of the s										
Image: standard s										
Image: construction of the second s										
Materials Subtotal\$2,551,229.00Materials SubtotalMaterialsSubtotal Labor + Materials </td <td></td>										
Image: Stabilities Stabilities     \$2,351,229,00     Image: Stabilities       Image: Stabilities     Image: Stabilities     Image: Stabilities     Image: Stabilities       Image: Stabilities     Image: Stabilities </td <td></td> <td>Matariala Subtatal</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>¢0 551 000 00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Matariala Subtatal					¢0 551 000 00			
Image: Construction of the second struction and Construction Management Additional Estimating Contingency 20%       Image: Construction Management 3%       Image: Construction Manageme							\$2,551,229.00			
Image: Subtotal Labor + Materials       Image: Subtotal Labor + Subtotal La										
Hard Costs Estimating Contingency       10%       317,19,147         Hard Costs Estimating Contingency       10%       \$18,910,622         Subtotal Hard Costs       10%       \$18,910,622         General Conditions       12%       10%         Subtotal Hard Costs       10%       \$306,147         General Conditions       12%       10%       \$306,147         General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)       8%       10%       \$\$567,319         Subtotal       Subtotal       10%       \$\$638,908,133         Bond & Insurance       3%       10%       \$\$638,908,13         Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management       3%       10%       \$\$638,908,13         Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management       3%       10%       \$\$638,908,13         TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS       10%       \$\$2,7,728,613		Subtotal Labor + Materials								¢17 101 /7/
Image Costs Subtrailing Contingency     10%     Image Costs Subtrail Interference       Image Costs Subtrail Hard Costs     Image Costs     Image Costs Subtrail Interference       Image Costs Subtrail Hard Costs     Image Costs     Image Costs Subtrail Interference       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail Subtrail Subtrailing Contingency     Image Costs Subtrail       Image Costs Subtrail     Image Costs Subtrail S		Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$1 710 1/7
Image: Construction of the costs       Image: Construction of the costs     Image: Construction of the costs     Image: Construction of the costs     Image: Construction of the costs       Image: Construction of the costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs       Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs       Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs     Image: Costs		Subtotal Hard Costs	10 / 0							\$18,010,622
Image: Construction of the second		Subiolai Haru Cosis								\$10,910,022
Image: Construction of the system     12%     Image: Constructor of the system     \$306,147       Image: Constructor of the system     General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)     8%     Image: Constructor of the system     \$1,512,850       Image: Construction of the system     Subtotal     Image: Constructor of the system     Image: Constructor of the system     \$567,319       Image: Construction of the system     Subtotal     Image: Constructor of the system     Image: Constructor of the system     \$5638,908,13       Image: Construction of the system     3%     Image: Constructor of the system     Image: Constructor of the system     \$638,908,13       Image: Construction of the system     3%     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system       Image: Construction of the system     3%     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system       Image: Construction of the system     3%     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system       Image: Construction of the system     20%     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system       Image: Construction of the system     20%     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system       Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system     Image: Construction of the system       Image: Construction of the s										
Contractor's Fee (OH & P)       8%       \$300, 11, 512, 850         General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)       8%       \$15, 512, 850         Special Inspection       3%       \$567, 319         Subtotal       \$200, 11, 512, 850       \$567, 319         Subtotal       \$200, 11, 512, 850       \$567, 319         Bond & Insurance       3%       \$638, 908, 13         Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management       3%       \$638, 908, 13         Contractor of the stimating Contingency       20%       \$45, 514, 950, 77         TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS       \$27, 728, 613       \$27, 728, 613		General Conditions	12%							\$306 147
Image: Second all Schedules of Contraction     0.000     <		General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8%							\$1 512 850
Subtotal     000,010       Subtotal     \$2,386,316       Bond & Insurance     3%       Escalation     3%       Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management     3%       Additional Estimating Contingency     20%       TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS     \$27,728,613		Special Inspection	3%				1	1		\$567,319
Construction     C		Subtotal	070				1	1		\$2,386,316
Bond & Insurance       3%       \$638.908.13         Escalation       3%       \$638.908.13         Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management       3%       \$638.908.13         Additional Estimating Contingency       20%       \$\$638.908.13         TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS       \$\$27.728.613		Gubiota					1	1		<i>42,000,010</i>
Escalation     3%     \$638,908.13       Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management     3%     \$638,908.13       Additional Estimating Contingency     20%     \$4,514,950.77       TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS     \$27,728.613		Rond & Insurance	3%				1	1		\$638,908,13
Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management       3%       \$638,908.13         Additional Estimating Contingency       20%       \$4,514,950.77         TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS       \$27,728.613       \$27,728.613		Escalation	3%							\$638.908.13
Additional Estimating Contingency 20% \$4,514,950.77 TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS \$27,728,613		Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management	3%							\$638.908.13
TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS \$27,728,613		Additional Estimating Contingency	20%		İ					\$4,514,950.77
		TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS		_						\$27,728,613

Notes:

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM).

# TABLE 2 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P2

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation Alternative <b>P2</b>								
	<ul> <li>Perform concrete and other repairs with lateral strengthening (partial seismic retrofit)</li> </ul>								
	seisme renomy								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$3,516,962.20		\$3,516,962	\$3,516,962	\$3,516,962
	Add New Piles					-			
	24"x0.75" Steel Pipe Piles (95 LF, furnish and install)	188	EA	\$7,200.00	\$10,750	\$1.353.600	\$2.021.000	\$17,950	\$3.374.600
	Steel Brackets (channels)	116,000	LBS	\$2.75	\$6	\$319,000	\$667,000	\$9	\$986,000
	Pile Repairs								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63,000.00	\$374,500.00	\$250.00	\$437,500
	Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143,360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
	FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
	Remove Ballered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
	Pier Deck Slab Soffit								
	Concrete Deck Soffitt Spall Repairs	21 700	SF	\$38.00	\$334.00	\$824 600 00	\$7 247 800	\$372.00	\$8 072 400
	Reinforcement Allowance	600	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$570.00	\$1.050.00	\$2.70	\$1.620
	Pier Deck Slab - Above Deck								
	Concrete Deck Spall Repairs	12,500	SF	\$18.00	\$38.00	\$225,000.00	\$475,000.00	\$56.00	\$700,000
	Reinforcement Allowance	400	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$380.00	\$700.00	\$2.70	\$1,080
	Bent Caps	4.000	05	¢ 45 00	¢000.00	<b>*7</b> 0,000,00	<b>*</b> 000 000 00	<b>\$045.00</b>	¢4.000.000
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,600	55	\$45.00	\$600.00	\$72,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$645.00	\$1,032,000
	Reinforcement Allowance	100		\$32.00 \$0.05	\$295.00 \$1.75	\$20,000.00	\$104,375.00	\$327.00 \$2.70	\$204,375 \$270
		100	LD	φ0.00	ψ1.75	ψ35.00	ψ175.00	ψ2.70	ψ210
	Replace Deck Panels								
	Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30,976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433,664	\$371,712	\$26.00	\$805,376
	Above Deck								
	Repair Guardrailing sections	450	LF	\$8.00	\$25.00	\$3,600.00	\$11,250.00	\$33.00	\$14,850
	Refurbish Deck Drains	52	EA	\$105.00	\$85.00	\$5,460.00	\$4,420.00	\$190.00	\$9,880
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	Materials Subtotal					\$2,551,229.00			
									ļ
	0.51.511.5								¢01 404 770
	Subtotal Labor + Materials	100/							\$21,101,773
		10%							φ2,110,177 \$22,211,051
	Subiolai Hard Costs								φ23,211,931
	General Conditions	12%					İ		\$306,147
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8%							\$1,856,956
	Special Inspection	3%							\$696,359
	Subtotal								\$2,859,462
									<b>A-</b>
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$782,142.38
	Escalation	3%							\$782,142.38
	Additional Estimating Contingency	3% 20%							\$102,142.38 \$5,527,130,46
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS	2070							\$33 944 979
									<b>400,077,019</b>

#### TABLE 3 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Rehabilitation Alternative P3

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit C	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work						-		
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation Alternative P3								
	- Perform concrete and other repairs without seismic retrofit								
	- Remove existing concrete deck/install lightweight deck system						1		
							1		
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$2,184,221		\$2,184,221	\$2,184,221	\$2,184,221
	Pile Repairs								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63,000.00	\$374,500.00	\$250.00	\$437,500
	Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143,360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
	FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
	Remove Battered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
	Remove Concrete Deck Panels								
	Remove Existing Concrete Deck Panels	66.000	SF		\$12.50		\$825.000.00	\$12.50	\$825,000
		,							+,
	Lightweight Deck System								
	Install new Aluminum Deck System (12' wide, 32 foot span)	36,000	SF	\$28.00	\$16.00	\$1,008,000	\$576,000	\$44.00	\$1,584,000
	Connections for Deck System	34,500	LBS	\$3.75	\$8.50	\$129,375	\$293,250	\$12.25	\$422,625
	Bent Caps								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,600	SF	\$45.00	\$600.00	\$72,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$645.00	\$1,032,000
	Concrete Crack Repairs	625		\$32.00	\$295.00	\$20,000.00	\$184,375.00	\$327.00	\$204,375
	Reinforcement Allowance	100	LD	\$U.95	φ1.75	\$95.00	\$175.00	<b>\$</b> 2.70	<b>φ</b> 270
	Renlace Deck Panels								
	Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30.976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433.664	\$371,712	\$26.00	\$805.376
						,	,		
	Above Deck								
	Repair Guardrailing sections	450	LF	\$8.00	\$25.00	\$3,600.00	\$11,250.00	\$33.00	\$14,850
	Refurbish Deck Drains	52	EA	\$105.00	\$85.00	\$5,460.00	\$4,420.00	\$190.00	\$9,880
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	Materials Subtotal					\$2,638,054.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials								\$9,464,957
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$946,496
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$10,411,452
							-		
	Conord Canditiana	100/							\$346 E66
	General Contractor's Ecc. (OH & P)	12% 20/					ł	-	40,000 \$220 016
	Special Inspection	3%							\$312 344
	Subtotal	570					ł		\$1,461,826
	Cubicar						1		÷.,.01,020
	Bond & Insurance	3%					1		\$356,198.36
	Escalation	3%					1		\$356,198.36
	Design, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction Management	3%							\$356,198.36
	Additional Estimating Contingency	20%							\$2,517,135.09
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS								\$15,459,009

Notes: 1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM).

#### TABLE 4 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement/Retrofit Alternative P4

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P4								
	<ul> <li>Concrete repairs with new steel pipe piles and steel moment frame</li> </ul>								
	Makilizatian ( Damakilizatian	4	1.0		<b>\$5,000,000</b>		<b>#</b> E 000 000	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>
		1	LO		\$3,069,696		\$5,069,696	\$5,069,696	\$5,069,696
	Pilos								
	2/1"x3//" Steel Pine Piles (05 LE furnish and install)	186	FΔ	\$8,000,00	\$13 500	\$1.488.000	\$2 511 000	\$21 500	\$3 999 000
		100	L/(	φ0,000.00	φ10,000	φ1,400,000	φ2,011,000	φ21,000	<i>\\</i> 0,000,000
	Pier Moment Frames								
	Steel Wide Flange Beams (W27)	1,040,000	LBS	\$3.75	\$4	\$3,900,000	\$3,640,000	\$7	\$7,540,000
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
	Pile Repairs								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63,000.00	\$374,500.00	\$250.00	\$437,500
	Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143,360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
	FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
	Remove Battered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
	Pier Deck Slab Soffit								
	Concrete Deck Soffitt Spall Repairs	21,700	SF	\$38.00	\$334.00	\$824,600.00	\$7,247,800	\$372.00	\$8,072,400
	Reinforcement Allowance	600	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$570.00	\$1,050.00	\$2.70	\$1,620
	Dian Daala Olah - Aharra Daala								
	Pier Deck Slad - Above Deck	10,500	05	¢10.00	¢20.00	¢225.000.00	¢475.000.00	¢56.00	¢700.000
	Concrete Deck Spall Repairs	12,500	OF LP	\$10.00 \$0.05	\$30.00 ¢1.75	\$225,000.00	\$475,000.00	\$30.00 \$2.70	\$700,000
	Remorcement Anowance	400	LD	φ <b>0.9</b> 5	φ1.70	\$360.00	\$700.00	φ2.70	\$1,000
	Bent Cans								
	Concrete Snall Renairs	1 600	SE	\$45.00	\$600.00	\$72,000,00	\$960,000,00	\$645.00	\$1.032.000
	Concrete Crack Renairs	625	IF	\$32.00	\$295.00	\$20,000,00	\$184 375 00	\$327.00	\$204 375
	Reinforcement Allowance	100	LR LR	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$95.00	\$175.00	\$2.70	\$270
			20	\$0.00	<i>\\</i>	\$00.00	\$110.00	¢20	¢2.0
	Replace Deck Panels								
	Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30.976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433.664	\$371.712	\$26.00	\$805.376
						1 1			
	Above Deck								
	Guard Railing (galv steel)	6,100	LF	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335,500.00	\$274,500.00	\$100.00	\$610,000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	Materials Subtotal					\$8,265,669.00			
									<b>*</b> ~~ <b>110 177</b>
	Subtotal Labor + Materials	100/							\$30,418,177
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$3,041,818
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$33,459,995
	Concrel Conditions	100/							¢001.000
	General Conditions	12%							\$991,880
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	0%							\$2,070,000
	Special inspection	3%							\$1,003,800
<u> </u>	Subtotal			-					φ <del>4</del> ,07∠,480
<u> </u>	Rond & Insurance	20/							\$1 1/3 07/ 2/
	Ecolotion	3%							\$1 143,974.24
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction	570							ψ1,170,374.24
	Management	7%							\$2,478 610 85
	Additional Estimating Contingency	20%							\$8,084.084.62
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS								\$50,983,119

Notes: 1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM).

# TABLE 5 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement/Retrofit Alternative P5

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit C	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation/Retrofit Alternative P5								
	<ul> <li>Concrete repairs with new steel pipe piles and steel bent truss frames</li> </ul>								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$5,165,620		\$5,165,620	\$5,165,620	\$5,165,620
	Piles								
	48"x1" Steel Pipe Piles (95 LF, furnish and install)	186	EA	\$12,000.00	\$16,000	\$2,232,000	\$2,976,000	\$28,000	\$5,208,000
	Pier Bent Truss Frames	225.000		¢2.50	¢4	¢000 500	¢000 500	¢7	¢1 645 000
	Steel Truss Flame Members (CT2, LS, etc.)	235,000	LDO	\$3. <u></u> 00	<b></b> \$4	<i>φ</i> 022,300	\$622,300	φ1	\$1,045,000
	Pile Renairs								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1 750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63,000,00	\$374 500 00	\$250.00	\$437 500
	Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143.360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
	FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
	Remove Battered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
	Pier Deck Slab Soffit								
	Concrete Deck Soffitt Spall Repairs	21,700	SF	\$38.00	\$334.00	\$824,600.00	\$7,247,800	\$372.00	\$8,072,400
	Reinforcement Allowance	600	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$570.00	\$1,050.00	\$2.70	\$1,620
	Pier Deck Slab - Above Deck	10 500	05	<b>*</b> 10.00	<b>^</b> ^^ ^		A 175 000 00		A700.000
	Concrete Deck Spall Repairs	12,500	SF	\$18.00	\$38.00	\$225,000.00	\$475,000.00	\$56.00	\$700,000
	Reinforcement Allowance	400	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$380.00	\$700.00	\$2.70	\$1,080
	Bont Cans								
	Concrete Snall Renairs	1 600	SE	\$45.00	00 0082	\$72,000,00	\$960.000.00	\$645.00	\$1.032.000
	Concrete Crack Repairs	625	IF	\$32.00	\$295.00	\$20,000,00	\$184 375 00	\$327.00	\$204 375
	Reinforcement Allowance	100	LB	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$95.00	\$175.00	\$2.70	\$270
	Replace Deck Panels								
	Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30,976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433,664	\$371,712	\$26.00	\$805,376
	Above Deck								
	Guard Railing (galv steel)	6,100	LF	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335,500.00	\$274,500.00	\$100.00	\$610,000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	Materials Subtotal					\$5,932,169.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials								\$25,828,101
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%	L						\$2,582,810
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$28,410,911
	Canaral Canditiana	100/							¢711.000
	Concret Contractor's Eas (OH & R)	12%							\$7 11,000 \$2 272 972
	General Contractor S Fee (OH & P)	20/							ψ∠,∠1∠,013 \$250 207
	Special Inspection Subtotal	3%							\$3,837 061
	Subiolar								ψ0,007,001
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$967 439 16
	Escalation	3%							\$967,439.16
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction	270							÷==:,:00:10
	Management	7%							\$2,096,118.17
	Additional Estimating Contingency	20%							\$6,836,570.04
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS								\$43,115,538

Notes: 1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM).

# TABLE 6 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement/Retrofit Alternative P6

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Quar	ntity	Unit (	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation/Retrotit Alternative P6								
	- Concrete repairs with new steel pipe piles, steel moment trames and								
	aluminum deck system								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$3,346,416		\$3,346,416	\$3,346,416	\$3,346,416
	<b>5</b> 1								
	Piles	100		¢7 000 00	¢10 750	¢1 220 200	¢1 000 500	¢17.050	¢2 220 700
	16 X0.5 Steel Fipe Files (95 LF, futfilstrand install)	100	EA	φ1,200.00	\$10,750	φ1,339,200	\$1,999,000	\$17,950	\$3,336,700
	Pier Moment Frames								
	Steel Wide Flange Beams (W24)	850,000	LBS	\$3.50	\$4	\$2,975,000	\$2,975,000	\$7	\$5,950,000
	Remove Concrete Deck Panels	00.000	<u> </u>		···		<b>600</b> - 00		<b>A</b> COT 0
	Remove Existing Concrete Deck Panels	66,000	SF		\$12.50		\$825,000	\$13	\$825,000
	Lightwoight Dock System								
	Lightweight Deck System	36,000	SE.	\$28.00	\$16.00	\$1,008,000	\$576.000	\$44.00	\$1 584 000
	instan new Aldminiam Deck System (12 wide, 52 loot span)	30,000	51	\$20.00	\$10.00	\$1,000,000	\$370,000	<del>44</del> .00	\$1,304,000
	Pile Repairs								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63,000.00	\$374,500.00	\$250.00	\$437,500
	Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143,360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
	FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
	Remove Battered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
	Bent Caps	4.000	05	¢ 45.00	<b>*</b> ~~~~~~~~	<b>*</b> 70.000.00	\$000 000 00	<b>#045.00</b>	¢4.000.000
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,600	SF	\$45.00	\$600.00	\$72,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$645.00	\$1,032,000
	Reinforcement Allowance	025 100		\$32.00 \$0.05	\$295.00 \$1.75	\$20,000.00 \$05.00	\$104,375.00	\$327.00 \$2.70	\$204,375 \$270
		100	LD	ψ0.95	φ1.75	φ95.00	φ175.00	φ2.70	ψ270
	Replace Deck Panels								
	Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30,976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433,664	\$371,712	\$26.00	\$805,376
	Above Deck								
	Guard Railing (galv steel)	6,100	LF	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335,500.00	\$274,500.00	\$100.00	\$610,000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	Materials Subtotal					\$7,149,319.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials	100/							\$20,078,497
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$2,007,850
	Subtotal Hard Costs								<b>⊅∠∠,∪ŏ</b> b,347
	General Conditions	12%							\$857 918
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8%							\$1,766,908
	Special Inspection	3%							\$662,590
	Subtotal								\$3,287,416
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$761,212.90
	Escalation	3%							\$761,212.90
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction	70/							¢1 640 004 00
	Management	20%							\$1,049,294.62 \$5 370 337 93
		20%							\$33 02/ 722
	TOTAL LOTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS								¢33,924,122

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM). Notes:

# TABLE 7 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement/Retrofit Alternative P7

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Rehabilitation/Retrotit Alternative P7								
	- Concrete repairs with new steel pipe piles, pile bent trusses and aluminum dock system								
	aluminum deck system								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$2,847,316		\$2,847,316	\$2,847,316	\$2,847,316
	<b>5</b> 1								
	Piles	100		¢10.000.00	¢14.000	¢0.000.000	¢0.644.000	¢05.000	¢4.650.000
	30 X0.75 Steel Fipe Files (95 LF, fulfilish and filstall)	100	EA	φ10,600.00	φ14,200	<i>φ</i> 2,000,000	φ2,041,200	φ25,000	\$4,050,000
-	Pile Bent Truss Frames								
	Steel Truss Frame Members (C14, L's, etc.)	282,000	LBS	\$3.50	\$4.10	\$987,000	\$1,156,200	\$8	\$2,143,200
	Remove Concrete Deck Panels								
	Remove Existing Concrete Deck Panels	66,000	SF		\$12.50		\$825,000	\$13	\$825,000
	Linktureinkt Dask Gratere								
	Lightweight Deck System	26.000	ee.	¢29.00	¢16.00	£1 008 000	¢576.000	\$44.00	¢1 594 000
	Install new Aluminum Deck System (12 wide, 32 loot span)	30,000	or	\$20.00	φ10.00	\$1,008,000	\$370,000	\$44.00	\$1,364,000
	Pile Renairs								
-	Concrete Spall Repairs	1.750	SF	\$36.00	\$214.00	\$63.000.00	\$374.500.00	\$250.00	\$437.500
	Concrete Crack Repairs	5,120	LF	\$28.00	\$100.00	\$143,360.00	\$512,000.00	\$128.00	\$655,360
	FRP Jacket Repair	25	EA	\$3,500.00	\$4,400.00	\$87,500.00	\$110,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$197,500
	Remove Battered Piles	120	EA		\$2,000.00		\$240,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$240,000
	Bent Caps								
	Concrete Spall Repairs	1,600	SF	\$45.00	\$600.00	\$72,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$645.00	\$1,032,000
	Concrete Crack Repairs	625		\$32.00	\$295.00	\$20,000.00	\$184,375.00	\$327.00	\$204,375
	Reiniorcement Allowance	100	LD	\$0.95	\$1.75	\$95.00	\$175.00	\$2.70	\$270
	Replace Deck Panels								
	Replace Precast Concrete Deck Panels	30.976	SF	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$433.664	\$371.712	\$26.00	\$805.376
									1
	Above Deck								
	Guard Railing (galv steel)	6,100	LF	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335,500.00	\$274,500.00	\$100.00	\$610,000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	Materials Subtotal					\$5,830,919.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials	100/							\$17,083,897
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$1,708,390
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$18,792,287
	General Conditions	12%							\$699 710
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8%							\$1,503,383
	Special Inspection	3%							\$563,769
	Subtotal								\$2,766,862
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$646,774.46
	Escalation	3%							\$646,774.46
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction								<b></b>
	Management	7%							\$1,401,344.67
		20%							¢4,070,009.04
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS								<b>⊅∠0,0</b> 24,582

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM). Notes:

# TABLE 8 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement Alternative P8

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Replacement Alternative <b>P8</b>								
	<ul> <li>Demo and replace pier with precast deck beams, cast-in-place topping and monopile concept.</li> </ul>								
	- Pier Area: 3000' I Ex 16' wide								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$2,363,550		\$2,363,550	\$2,363,550	\$2,363,550
	Demolition								
	Demolish Existing Pier Structure	66,000	SF		\$22		\$1,452,000	\$22	\$1,452,000
	Piloo								
	30"x3/4" Steel Pine Piles (95 LE furnish and install)	90	FA	\$8,500,00	\$14 000	\$765.000	\$1 260 000	\$22 500	\$2 025 000
				\$0,000.00	¢.1,000	\$100,000	¢1,200,000	<b>\$22,000</b>	\$2,020,000
	Pier Deck Beams								
	20" deep Precast Concrete Channel Beams (32' length)	360	EA	\$2,500.00	\$1,800	\$900,000	\$648,000	\$4,300	\$1,548,000
	Bent Caps								
	CIP Concrete Bent Caps	1,400	CY	\$155.00	\$1,500.00	\$217,000	\$2,100,000	\$1,655.00	\$2,317,000
	Cast-in-Place Deck Topping	26.000	05	¢10.00	¢0.00	¢260.000	¢200.000	¢10.00	¢648.000
	CIP Deck Topping	30,000	ər	\$10.00	\$6.00	\$360,000	\$200,000	\$10.00	\$040,000
	Water Pipe Hangers								
		10	EA	\$85.00	\$135.00	\$850.00	\$1,350.00	\$220.00	\$2,200
	Alexan Deele								
	Above Deck Guard Bailing (galy steel)	6 100	15	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335 500 00	\$274 500 00	\$100.00	\$610.000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5.600.00	\$1.500.00	\$672.000.00	\$180,000,00	\$7.100.00	\$852,000
				+=,======	÷ .,	+,		<b></b>	+,
	Materials Subtotal					\$3,250,350.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Matariala								¢11 017 750
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$11,817,750
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$12,999,525
									,,
	General Conditions	12%							\$390,042
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8%							\$1,039,962
	Special Inspection Subtotal	3%							φ309,900 \$1,819,990
	Gubiota								÷.,510,000
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$444,585.44
	Escalation	3%							\$444,585.44
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction	70/							¢062.268.40
	Management Additional Estimating Contingency	/ % 20%							3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS	2370							\$19,813,691

Notes:

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM).

# TABLE 9 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement Alternative P9

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	rkeley Municipal Pier							Date:	16-Nov-17
		Qua	ntity	Unit	Cost	Total	Total	Total	Total
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Replacement Alternative <b>P9</b>								
	- Demo and replace pier with cast-in-place beams and monopile concept								
	- Pier Area: 3000° LFX 16° Wide								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$2,069,940		\$2,069,940	\$2,069,940	\$2,069,940
	Demolition								
	Demolish Existing Pier Structure	66.000	SF		\$20		\$1,320,000	\$20	\$1,320,000
		00,000	0.		Ŷ20		\$1,020,000	¢20	¢1,020,000
	Piles								
	30"x3/4" Steel Pipe Piles (95 LF, furnish and install)	90	EA	\$8,500.00	\$14,000	\$765,000	\$1,260,000	\$22,500	\$2,025,000
	CID Dier Deek Deeme								
	CIP Pier Deck Beams	2 100	CV	\$160.00	¢1 275	\$226.000	¢0 997 500	¢1 525	¢2 222 E00
		2,100	CI	\$100.00	φ1,373	\$330,000	\$2,007,300	\$1,000	\$3,223,300
	Bent Caps								
	CIP Concrete Bent Caps	1,400	CY	\$155.00	\$1,500.00	\$217,000	\$2,100,000	\$1,655	\$2,317,000
	Water Pipe Hangers	1.0							
	Replace Pipe Hangers	10	EA	\$85.00	\$135.00	\$850.00	\$1,350.00	\$220.00	\$2,200
	Above Deck								
	Guard Bailing (galv steel)	6 100	LE	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335 500 00	\$274 500 00	\$100.00	\$610,000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5.600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672.000.00	\$180.000.00	\$7.100.00	\$852,000
		-							
	Materials Subtotal					\$2 326 350 00			
						\$2,020,000.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials								\$12,419,640
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$1,241,964
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$13,661,604
	General Conditions	12%							\$270.162
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8%							\$1 092 928
	Special Inspection	3%							\$409,848
	Subtotal	270							\$1,781,938
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$463,306.27
	Escalation	3%							\$463,306.27
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction	70/							¢4 000 000 00
	Management	20%							\$1,003,830.26
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS	20%							\$20 648 016
									φ <b>∠</b> 0,040,010

Notes:

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM). 2. Repair quantities shown are approximate and based on field observations.

# TABLE 10 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement Alternative P10

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier Date: 1								16-Nov-17
		Quantity Unit Cost		Total	Total	Total	Total		
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Replacement Alternative <b>P10</b>								
	<ul> <li>Demo and replace pier with precast deck plans and precast concrete niles</li> </ul>								
	- 3.000 LF x 16' wide								
	MODILIZATION / DEMODILIZATION	1	LS		\$2,095,980		\$2,095,980	\$2,095,980	\$2,095,980
	Demolition								
	Demolish Existing Pier Structure	66,000	SF		\$22		\$1,452,000	\$22	\$1,452,000
	Dilee								
	Piles 24"octogonal precast concrete piles (85   F. furnish and install)	184	FΔ	\$4,600,00	\$10,200	\$846 400	\$1 876 800	\$14 800	\$2 723 200
		104	LA	φ+,000.00	ψ10,200	ψ0 <del>1</del> 0, <del>1</del> 00	ψ1,070,000	\$14,000	ψ2,720,200
	CIP Pier Deck Beams								
	CIP Concrete Deck Beams	2,100	CY	\$160.00	\$1,275	\$336,000	\$2,677,500	\$1,435	\$3,013,500
	Bent Cans								
	CIP Concrete Bent Caps	1,400	CY	\$155.00	\$1,150.00	\$217,000	\$1,610,000	\$1,305	\$1,827,000
	Water Pipe Hangers								
	Replace Pipe Hangers	10	EA	\$85.00	\$135.00	\$850.00	\$1,350.00	\$220.00	\$2,200
	Above Deck								
	Guard Railing (galv steel)	6.100	LF	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335.500.00	\$274,500.00	\$100.00	\$610.000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
	-								
	Materials Subtotal					\$2,407,750.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials								\$12 575 880
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$1,257,588
	Subtotal Hard Costs	,							\$13,833,468
									<b>A</b>
	General Conditions	12%							\$288,930
	General Contractor's Fee (OH & P)	8% 2%							\$1,106,677
	Subtotal	570							\$1.810.611
	Cubica	1							÷ .,5 .0,0 11
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$469,322.38
	Escalation	3%							\$469,322.38
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction	70/							\$1 016 96F 17
	Management Additional Estimating Contingency	20%							\$3.316.544.85
	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS	2370							\$20,916,134

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM). 2. Repair quantities shown are approximate and based on field observations. Notes:

# TABLE 11 ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST City of Berkeley - Municipal Pier Replacement Alternative P11

Client: City of Berkeley Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier

Project: Be	Project: Berkeley Municipal Pier Date:							16-Nov-17	
		Quantity Unit Cost Total		Total	Total	Total	Total		
	Description - Dock Extension	No	Unit	Mat'l	Labor	Material Cost	Labor Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
	General Description of Work								
	Berkeley Municipal Pier - Replacement Alternative P11								
	- Demo and replace pier with steel monopiles, prefabricated steel bent cans and lightwaight deck system								
	- Pier Area: 3000' LEx 12' wide								
	Mobilization / Demobilization	1	LS		\$1,958,040		\$1,958,040	\$1,958,040	\$1,958,040
	Demolition								
	Demolish Existing Pier Structure	66.000	SF		\$22		\$1.452.000	\$22	\$1,452,000
					T==		÷ .,		÷ · ; · · · · · · · · ·
	Piles								
	30"x3/4" Steel Pipe Piles (95 LF, furnish and install)	90	EA	\$13,750.00	\$15,000	\$1,237,500	\$1,350,000	\$28,750	\$2,587,500
	Steel Bent Caps								
	Steel Prefabricated Bent Caps	235.000	LBS	\$2.75	\$8.75	\$646.250	\$2.056.250	\$11.50	\$2,702,500
	Lightweight Deck System								
	Install new Aluminum Deck System (12' wide, 34 foot span)	36,000	S⊦	\$28.00	\$16.00	\$1,008,000	\$576,000	\$44.00	\$1,584,000
	Water Pipe Hangers								
		10	EA	\$85.00	\$135.00	\$850.00	\$1,350.00	\$220.00	\$2,200
	Above Deck								
	Guard Railing (galv steel)	6,100	LF	\$55.00	\$45.00	\$335,500.00	\$274,500.00	\$100.00	\$610,000
	Light Poles and Fixtures	120	EA	\$5,600.00	\$1,500.00	\$672,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$7,100.00	\$852,000
						<b>*</b> 0.000.400.00			
	Materials Subtotal					\$3,900,100.00			
	Subtotal Labor + Materials								\$11,748,240
	Hard Costs Estimating Contingency	10%							\$1,174,824
	Subtotal Hard Costs								\$12,923,064
		100/							<b>A</b> 100 0 10
	General Conditions	12%							\$468,012
	Snecial Inspection	3%							\$387 692
	Subtotal	570				1	-		\$1,889.549
	Castoar								+ .,,010
	Bond & Insurance	3%							\$444,378.39
	Escalation	3%							\$444,378.39
	Design, Geotechnical, Permitting, Owner Administration and Construction								<b>*</b> ****
	Management	7%							\$962,819.85
	Additional Estimated Construction Costs	20%							φ3, 140,213.96 \$19 804 464
									φ13,004,404

1. The cost estimate presented above is considered rough order of magnitude (ROM). 2. Repair quantities shown are approximate and based on field observations. Notes:

# Appendix B

Pier Layout and Condition Rating





Filename: \lghdnet\ghd\US\San Francisco\Projects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 EXISTING SITE PLAN FIGURE.dwg Plot Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:21 PM





Filename: \\ghdnetghd\US\San Francisco\Projects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 PIER PLAN FIGURE.dwg
Plot Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:23 PM





Filename: \\ghdnetghd\US\San Francisco\Projects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 PIER PLAN FIGURE.dwg
Plot Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:23 PM





Ľ**u – J** 



Source



Source











LEG	END			
RATING		DECK OR BENT CAP	PILE	
6	GOOD	*****	0	
5	SATISFACTORY		0	
4	FAIR		4	
3	POOR	*****		
2	SERIOUS		×	OR DISCONNECTED
1	CRITICAL	*	м	PILE MISSING



Filename: \lghdnet'ghd1USISan FranciscolProjects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 PIER RATING PLAN FIGURE.dwg
Plot Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:29 PM



Source:

# Appendix C

Rehabilitation, Retrofit and Replacement Sketches





# **ALTERNATIVE P4**

PILES WITH MOMENT FRAMES

Project No. 11125268 Report No. -Date NOV 2017



EXISTING BENTS SPACED @ 16'-0" ON CENTER



EXISTING BENTS SPACED @ 16'-0" ON CENTER



# **ALTERNATIVE P6**

Project No. 11125268 Report No. -Date NOV 2017







Filename: \\ghdnet\ghd\US\San Francisco\Projects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 REPLACEMENT FIGURE.dwg Piol Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:35 PM



Filename: \lghdnet\ghd\US\San Francisco\Projects\111\1125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 REPLACEMENT FIGURE.dwg Piol Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:35 PM



Filename: \\ghdnet\ghd\US\San Francisco\Projects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 REPLACEMENT FIGURE.dwg Plot Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:35 PM

FIGURE C-7


Filename: \\ghdnet\ghd1US\San Francisco\Projects\111\11125268 Berkeley Municipal Pier Assessment\06-CAD\Sheets\11125268 REPLACEMENT FIGURE.dwg Plot Date: 16 November 2017 - 1:35 PM

# Appendix D

**Underwater Inspection Report** 

SEA ENGINEERING, INC.

# City of Berkeley, California Berkeley Municipal Pier Underwater Inspection Report





10/17/2017

1.	Executive Summary	1
2.	Introduction	2
2.1.	Site Description	2
2.2.	Inspection Scope and Methodology	2
3.	Description of Structures	2
3.1.	Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles	2
3.2.	Timber Batter Piles	3
4.	Observed Conditions	3
4.1.	Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles	3
4.2.	Timber Batter Piles	4
5.	Evaluation and Assessment	5
5.1.	Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles	5
5.2.	Timber Batter Piles	5
6.	Recommendations	6
6.1.	Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles	6
6.2.	Timber Batter Piles	6

#### APPENDIX 1: FIGURES

#### **APPENDIX 2: PHOTOGRAPHS**

#### **APPENDIX 3: INSPECTION NOTES**

**APPENDIX 4: REFERENCES** 



Sea Engineering, Inc. 200 Washington Street, Suite 107 Santa Cruz, CA 95060 PH 831-421-0871 FX 831-421-0875 www.seaengineering.com

#### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

October 17, 2017

GHD 505 Montgomery Street San Francisco, CA 94111 (415)283-4970

Attention: Craig Lewis, SE (<u>craig.lewis@ghd.com</u>)

Subject: City of Berkeley, CA – Municipal Pier – Underwater Inspection Report

Dear Mr. Lewis,

Sea Engineering, Inc. (SEI) is pleased to present the following Underwater Inspection report to GHD for City of Berkeley, CA (the city) Municipal Pier in Berkeley, CA. SEI prepared this report at the request of GHD and the city following completion of underwater inspection of Municipal Pier piles. The inspections were executed by an SEI team consisting of a PE diver and commercial divers. This report and its appendices were produced by SEI personnel that performed the inspection.

The following report includes an executive summary, descriptions of the piles inspected at Berkeley Pier, an account of the conditions observed during the inspection, evaluation and assessment of the inspected elements, as well as recommended follow up actions. Condition plans, inspection notes, photographs (above water and underwater) and reference material are included in appendices to the report.

#### 1. Executive Summary

SEI performed the underwater inspection of the piles at Berkeley Municipal Pier over ten days between August 7 and August 18, 2017. The inspected portion of Berkeley Municipal Pier is comprised of the accessible portion of the pier from the inshore abutment to pile bent 188 (See Figure 1). Piles inspected by SEI include reinforced concrete encased timber plumb piles and timber batter piles.

Berkeley Municipal Pier concrete encased timber support piles are in **Poor** condition due to widespread corrosion cracks, localized closed and open spalls, and isolated structural cracks. Berkeley Municipal Pier timber batter piles are in **Critica**l condition due to section loss from the effects of marine borer infestation and piles disconnected from pile caps. SEI recommends repair of support piles with new partial-height concrete encasements. No repairs are recommended for timber batter piles if lateral loading conditions are expected to remain unchanged.

#### 2. Introduction

#### 2.1. <u>Site Description</u>

Berkeley Municipal Pier is located just off the eastern shore of the San Francisco Bay on the southeast side of the Berkeley Marina in the City of Berkeley, CA 94720 (See Photograph 1). The project site consists of the plumb and batter piles supporting the pier between the abutment and pile bent 188. The Berkeley Municipal Pier has been closed off from public access since 2015 due to poor condition of the reinforced concrete deck planks. The pier was previously used for pedestrian access to the waterfront for fishing and public views of the San Francisco Bay.

#### 2.2. Inspection Scope and Methodology

The scope of the underwater inspection consists of Level I above and below water visual & tactile inspection of 100% of the concrete encased timber support piles and timber batter piles (approximately 600 piles) from the mudline to the pile cap, as well as Level II cleaning and close visual & tactile inspection at three (3) underwater elevations (mudline, mid-water, & tidal zone) on 10% of the concrete encased timber support piles (approximately 56 piles). Level III concrete cores were removed from four (4) concrete encased timber support piles to view the localized condition of the original timber piles. SEI assigned ratings to inspected piles utilizing a condition rating system which follows requirements found in California State Lands Commission (CSLC) Marine Oil Terminal Engineering Standards (MOTEMS) and American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Waterfront Facilities Inspection and Assessment Standard Practice Manual. SEI's inspection notes also provide descriptions of observed damage including; damage type, approximate elevation, location, and extent. Above water and underwater photographs were taken of typical pile damage and deterioration.

SEI completed the underwater inspection of Berkeley Municipal Pier utilizing Surface Supplied Diving (SSD) techniques and equipment which include hardwired communication between the diving inspector and note taker, a continuous low pressure (LP) air supply from a topside diving compressor, as well as back up and emergency high pressure (HP) air. Inspection notes were recorded by hand on pre-printed sheets by the topside note taker during diving operations. Due to water depths of less than 15 feet of seawater (fsw), SEI utilized No Decompression (No "D") dive tables and a three (3) man dive team for the underwater inspection. The dive team was led by Paul Roberts of SEI, a California Registered Professional Engineer (P.E.) and commercially trained and ADCI certified diver, who performed at approximately 50% of the inspection. Armando Gonzalez and Kenny Walton, both ADCI certified commercial divers with SEI, also performed portions of the inspection. Diving operations were staged from SEI's 25' dive boat, MV Response, for the duration of the project.

Following a thorough review of the inspection findings, SEI assigned overall condition ratings to the concrete encased timber plumb piles and timber batter piles using a rating system found in the ASCE Manual 130 (See Appendix 4). Pile damage ratings from the inspection, as well as condition ratings for the piles are provided in the Observed Conditions portion (Section 4) of this report.

#### 3. Description of Structures

#### 3.1. <u>Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles</u>

Berkeley Municipal Pier reinforced concrete pile caps and deck slabs are supported by approximately 564 concrete encased timber piles arranged in 188 bents (280-467), from

Project East to West or inshore to offshore) and three (3) rows (A-C from Project North to South). Typical concrete encasements are square in cross-section and measure 20 in. square (12 in. across the flat portion of each face with approximately 6 in. wide chamfered corners).

#### 3.2. <u>Timber Batter Piles</u>

Timber batter piles are scattered along the north and south edge of Berkeley Municipal Pier, adjacent to A and C row plumb piles. Typical timber batter piles are round in cross section and measure approximately 12 in. in diameter. While reference drawings provided to SEI indicate that there should be two (2) timber batter piles every fourth pile bent, there are approximately only 43 remaining timber batter piles.

#### 4. Observed Conditions

#### 4.1. <u>Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles</u>

Berkeley Pier concrete encased timber support piles are in **Poor** condition due to widespread corrosion cracks, localized closed and open spalls, and isolated structural cracks. Pile damage is typically located in the splash zone, between the Mean High Water (MHW) elevation and the pile cap.

Table 4.1 below summarizes the quantity and percentage of Berkeley Pier concrete encased timber support piles observed with each damage type.

	Damage Type										
	Vertical Corrosion Cracks up to ¼ in. wide	Vertical Corrosion Cracks over ¼ in. wide	Closed Spalls	Open Spalls	Structural Cracks up to ¼ in. wide	No Damage					
Percentage of Piles (%)	55%	2%	14%	6%	3%	27%					
Number of Piles (#) <sup>*</sup>	310	10	77	36	15	151					

 Table 4.1 Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles – Damage Summary

\* Some piles exhibit more than one damage type (other than piles with No Damage)

See Photographs 2-7 for examples of vertical corrosion cracks up to ¼ in. wide; Photographs 8-9 for examples of vertical corrosion cracks over ¼ in. wide; Photographs 10-14 for examples of closed spalls; Photographs 15-17 for examples of open spalls; Photograph 18 for an example of a structural crack up to ¼ in. wide; and Photographs 19-20 for examples of undamaged piles.

Table 4.2 below summarizes the Damage Ratings for Berkeley Municipal Pier concrete encased timber support piles (MN = Minor/No Damage, MD = Moderate, MJ = Major, SV = Severe). Guidelines for Condition Assessment Ratings and Reinforced Concrete Damage

Ratings can each be found in Appendix 4. See Figures 1-6, Berkeley Municipal Pier Pile Condition plans, for a visual representation of the pile damage rating locations. Detailed records for each concrete encased timber support pile inspected can be found in Appendix 3.

	Pile Damage Rating										
	No Damage (ND)	Minor (MN)	Moderate (MD)	Major (MJ)	Severe (SV)						
# of Piles (564 Inspected)	152	51	256	105	0						
% of Piles	27%	9%	45%	19%	0%						

#### Table 4.2 Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles – Damage Rating Summary

Piles rated Minor (MN) typically have occasional corrosion stains or small pop-out corrosion spalls. Piles rated Moderate (MD) typically exhibit corrosion cracks up to ½ in. wide or structural cracks up to 1/16 in. wide. Piles rated Major (MJ) typically have open or closed spalls, corrosion cracks wider than ¼ in., or structural cracks 1/16 in. to ¼ in. wide.

Level III concrete cores were removed from four (4) piles: 301C, 358A, 386C, and 429A. No damage was noted on any of the four piles during visual inspection of the exposed concrete or timber (See Photographs 21-22).

#### 4.2. <u>Timber Batter Piles</u>

Berkeley Municipal Pier timber batter piles are in **Critical** condition due to section loss from the effects of marine borer infestation (See Photograph 23) and piles disconnected from pile caps.

Table 4.3 below summarizes the quantity and percentage of Berkeley Pier timber batter piles observed with each damage type.

Table 4.3 Timber Batter Piles – Damage Summ
---

		Damage Type		
	Section Loss From Marine Borer	Pile Disconnected from Cap*	Minor Checks & Splits	No Damage
Approximate Percentage of Piles (%)	79%	21%	7%	2%
Approximate Number of Piles	34	9	3	1

 Piles disconnected from cap may also exhibit section loss from the effects of marine borer activity

Table 4.4 below summarizes the Damage Ratings for Berkeley Municipal Pier timber batter piles. Guidelines for Condition Assessment Ratings and Timber Structural Element Damage Ratings can each be found in Appendix 4. See Figures 1-6, Berkeley Municipal Pier condition plans, for a visual representation of the timber batter pile damage rating locations. Detailed records for each timber batter pile inspected can be found in Appendix 3.

	Pile Damage Rating									
	No Damage (ND)	Minor (MN)	Moderate (MD)	Major (MJ)	Severe (SV)					
# of Piles (43 Inspected)	1	3	5	5	29					
% of Piles	2%	7%	12%	12%	67%					

#### Table 4.4 Timber Batter Piles – Damage Rating Summary

Piles rated Minor (MN) typically have checks or splits less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  in. wide. Piles rated Moderate (MD) typically exhibit evidence of marine borer activity and section loss up to 25%. Piles rated Major (MJ) typically have section loss 25 to 50% from the effects of marine borer infestation. Piles rated Major (SV) typically exhibit section loss more than 50% and/or loss of connection between the pile and pile cap.

#### 5. Evaluation and Assessment

#### 5.1. <u>Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles</u>

Damage to concrete encased timber support piles is typically the result of corrosion to the steel reinforcement. Over the approximately 91 years following installation of the encased piles, chlorides from the San Francisco Bay have intruded through the concrete to the embedded depth of steel rebar. In the splash zone and tidal zone, where the relative oxygen content is high and cycles of wetting and drying occur, steel rebar has corroded. Corrosion product (rust) expands in the concrete, resulting in vertical corrosion cracks, closed spalls and open spalls.

While there is widespread advanced deterioration of the concrete encasements, it does not significantly reduce the load-bearing capacity of the structure. No severe damage (structural cracks wider than 1/4 in., section loss of more than 30%, broken encasements) was observed during the inspection.

#### 5.2. <u>Timber Batter Piles</u>

While there is widespread advanced damage to the timber batter piles (failed connections, severe section loss), it does not significantly reduce the load-bearing capacity of the structure. Lateral loading of the pier is limited to environmental forces (wind, waves and currents) and it is likely that the concrete encased timber support piles provide sufficient resistance as no sign of

overstress was observed during the inspection, even though the majority of the original timber batter piles are missing.

#### 6. Recommendations

#### 6.1. Concrete Encased Timber Support Piles

SEI recommends repair of concrete piles with corrosion cracks, closed spalls, open spalls and structural cracks. Typical repairs recommended for these damage types include removal of loose concrete, replacement corroded rebar, and encasement of the damaged area in reinforced concrete.

#### 6.2. <u>Timber Batter Piles</u>

No repairs are recommended for timber batter piles if lateral loading conditions are expected to remain unchanged.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

#### SEA ENGINEERING, INC.

Paul L. Roberts, P.E. West Coast Area Manager - Civil Engineer/Diver proberts@seaengineering.com (831)421-0871 APPENDIX 1: FIGURES













### APPENDIX 2: PHOTOGRAPHS



PHOTOGRAPH 1: Berkeley Municipal Pier



PHOTOGRAPH 2: Pile 287C, vertical crack ¼ in. wide



PHOTOGRAPH 3: Pile 306A, vertical crack less than ¼ in. wide



**PHOTOGRAPH 4**: Pile 379C, vertical crack less than <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> in. wide with corrosion staining and efflorescence



PHOTOGRAPH 5: Pile 384B, vertical crack 1/4 in. wide



PHOTOGRAPH 6: Pile 423C, vertical crack 1/4 in. wide



PHOTOGRAPH 7: Pile 423B, vertical crack less than 1/4 in. wide (Tidal Zone Level II)



**PHOTOGRAPH 8:** Pile 289C, vertical crack wider than ¼ in.



Page 5

**PHOTOGRAPH 9:** Pile 304C, vertical crack wider than ¼ in.



PHOTOGRAPH 10: Pile 303A, closed spall



PHOTOGRAPH 11: Pile 311A, closed spall



PHOTOGRAPH 12: Pile 408C, closed spall



PHOTOGRAPH 13: Pile 443C, closed spall



PHOTOGRAPH 14: Pile 445C, closed spall





PHOTOGRAPH 15: Pile 339C, open spall



PHOTOGRAPH 16: Pile 403C, open spall



PHOTOGRAPH 17: Pile 445C, open spall (underwater Level II)



**PHOTOGRAPH 18:** Pile 301C, horizontal crack



PHOTOGRAPH 19: Pile 309A, undamaged



PHOTOGRAPH 20: Pile 366A, undamaged

Page 11



PHOTOGRAPH 21: Pile 429A, Level III concrete core hole



PHOTOGRAPH 22: Pile 429A, view of concrete and timber inside Level III core hole



PHOTOGRAPH 23: Pile 376A-BATT, Severe section loss from marine borer

## APPENDIX 3: INSPECTION NOTES

Structure	Structure: Berkeley       Location: Berkeley, CA       Company: Sea Engineering, Inc.       Divers: P. Roberts         Municipal Pier       A. Gonzalez         Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE       Inspection Date: August 7, 2017       K. Walton													
Time of Day: 0915     Tide: +2.0'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:													Pile Material:	
		-			-				Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	ation	Level II Insp	Le III I	evel nsp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ing			Comments	
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	SV			
286	А	Х			6'		Х					CONCRETE ENCASED	TIMBER BEARING PILE (TYP A, B, C)	
286	В						Х							
286	С						Х							
286	C-BATT							Х				TIMBER BATTER PILE (	TYP C-BAT, A-BAT)	
287	С								Х			VERTICAL CRACK (VC)	NORTHWEST (NW) CORNER (CRNR)	
												1/4" WIDE (W) X 8" LON	G (L), VC SW CRNR 1/4" W X 3' L	
												AT PILE TOP		
287	В						Х							
287	Α						Х							
288	А								Х			VC WEST (W) FACE 1/1	6" W X 3' L WITH (W/) CORROSION	
	CORROSION STAIN (CS) AT PILE TOP													
ADDITIC	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Structure: Berkeley       Location: Berkeley, CA       Company: Sea Engineering, Inc.       Divers: P. Roberts         Municipal Pier       A. Gonzalez         Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE       Inspection Date: August 7, 2017       K. Walton												
Time of Day: 0944 Tide: +2.5' Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):											Sheet):	Pile Material:	
Bearing, Batter												Concrete, Timber	
Loca	ation	Level II Insp	Le III I	evel Insp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ing			Comments
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv		
288	В						Х						
288	С									Х		1/2 SQUARE FOOT (SF)	CLOSED SPALL SW CRNR AT TOP
289	С									Х		3 SF OPEN/CLOSED SP	ALL W/EXPOSED REBAR AND
												MULTIPLE VC UP TO 1/2	2" WIDE SE CRNR AT TOP
289	В	Х			6'					Х		2 SF X 1" DEEP OPEN S	PALL S FACE / SW CRNR W/CS
												APPROX. 6' BELOW (BL	W) PILE CAP (PC). VC 1/8" W X 2' L
												EXTENDING UPWARD F	FROM SPALL
289	А									Х		VC 1/8" W X 4' L W' CS 8	SE CRNR 1' BLW PC. OPEN/CLOSED
												OPEN SPALL 1 SF X 1.5	" DEEP W/CS NE CRNR 4' BLW PC.
												SPALL 1/2 SF X 1" DEEF	PW/CS NE CRNR 6' BLW PC. VC 1/16"
												W X 2.5' L AT TOP. CS 2	2" DIAMETER (DIA) S FACE 2' BLW PC
	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Structure: Berkeley       Location: Berkeley, CA       Company: Sea Engineering, Inc.       Divers: P. Roberts         Municipal Pier       A. Gonzalez         Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE       Inspection Date: August 7, 2017       K. Walton												
Time of Day: 0944     Tide: +2.5'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:												Pile Material:	
	,	- ·							Bearing	, Batte	r	·	Concrete, Timber
Loca	ation	Level II Insp	Le III I	evel Insp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ting			Comments
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv		
290	А								Х			CS N FACE 2' BLW PC.	VC 1/8" W X 2' L NE CRNR AT TOP.
												VC 1/4" W X 3' L NW CR	NR AT TOP
290	В									Х		OPEN SPALL 2 SF X 1"	DEEP NW CRNR W/CS. CS 2" DIA
												W FACE 3' BLW PC	
290	С									Х		VC 1/16" W X 4' LONG V	V/ EFFLORESCENCE (EFF) SW CRNR
												AT TOP. OPEN/CLOSE	D SPALL 4 SF X 2.5" DEEP SW CRNR
												5' BLW PC	
290	C-BATT										Х	90% SECTION LOSS (S	L) FROM MARINE BORER (MB)
291	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	//VC 1/8" W X 4' L W/CS S FACE AT
												TOP. VC 1/8" W X 3' L V	W/CS SW CRNR AT TOP. CLOSED
												SPALL 2 SF W/CS NW C	CRNR AT TOP. VC 1/16" X 2' W/CS
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: PILE 291-C NOTES CONTINUED:E FACE AT TOP													
	ION RATI		D:										

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure:       Berkeley       Location:       Berkeley, CA       Company:       Sea Engineering, Inc.       Divers:       P. Roberts         Municipal Pier       A. Gonzalez       A. Gonzalez       K. Walton         Inspection Team Leader:       Paul Roberts, PE       Inspection Date:       August 7, 2017       K. Walton												P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 0944 Tide: +2.5'									Pile Type Bearing	(Bearing, . Batte	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material: Concrete. Timber
Location Level II Level Water Pile Condition Insp III Insp Depth								dition Rat	ing	-		Comments	
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv		
291	В								Х			VC 1/8" x 21" W/CS N FA	ACE 2' BLW PC
291	Α									Х		OPEN SPALL 6"X2" DEE	EP N FACE 2' BLW PC
												(REMNANT BLACK EPC	DXY PAINT/COAT ON PARTS
												OF SPALLED AREA)	
292	А								Х			VC HL X 3' W/CS NW CF	RNR AT TOP
												VC HL X 3' W FACE AT	ТОР
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS SW CF	RNR 3' BLW PC
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS S FA	CE 3' BLW PC
									1			VC 1/16'X1.5' W/CS SE	CRNR 3' BLW PC
									1			VC HLX X 1' W/CS E FA	CE 3 BLW
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: PILE 292-A NOTES CONTINUED VC 1/16" X 1.5' W/CS NE CRNR 3' BLW													
CONDIT	ION RAT	ING LEGENI	D:										

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Structure:       Berkeley       Location:       Berkeley, CA       Company:       Sea Engineering, Inc.       Divers:       P. Roberts         Municipal Pier       A. Gonzalez         Inspection Team Leader:       Paul Roberts, PE       Inspection Date:       August 7, 2017       K. Walton												
Time of Day: 1042     Tide: +3.6'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:												Pile Material:	
Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber											Concrete, Timber		
Loca	ation	Level II Insp	Le III I	evel Insp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	ndition Ra	ting			Comments
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv		
292	В	Х			8'				Х			VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS W F	ACE 2' BLW PC
												VC 1/16" X 3' W/CS N FA	ACE 1' BLW PC
												HONEYCOMBING N FA	CE 3' AT TOP. CLEANED ML, MW &TZ
292	С									Х		VC 1/16" X 3' W/CS S FA	ACE AT TOP
												CLOSED SPALL 4 SF W	//C SE CRNR AT TOP
												VC HL X 1' W/C E FACE	1' BLW PC
293	С									Х		VC 1/8" X 5' W/CS S FAG	CE AT TOP.
												VC 1/8" X 5' W/CS SE C	RNR AT TOP.
												CLOSED SPALL 3 SF S	W CRNR AT TOP W/ASSOCIATED
												CRACKING UP TO 1/4"	WIDE AND CS
												VC HL X 2' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP
ADDITIC PILE 293-	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: PILE 293-C NOTES CONTINUED: VC 1/16" X 3' W FACE AT TOP ; VC 1/16"X 1.5' NW CRNR 3' BLW PC.												
CONDIT NI = Not	ION RATI inspected	NG LEGEN , inaccessib	D: le										

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage
Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1042  Tide: +3.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Concrete  Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Insp  III Insp  Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Location  Level if  Level water  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
293	В								Х			VC 1/16" X 3' W/CS & EF	F SW CRNR AT TOP	
293	A									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X4' W/CS N FAG	CE AT TOP	
294	А						Х							
294	В								X			VC 1/6"X4.5' W/CS W F/	ACE AT TOP.	
294	С									Х		VC 1/16" X 2' W FACE 2'	BLW PC	
												VC 1/16" X 4' W/CS SW	CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/16" X 3' W/CS & E	FF NE CRNR AT TOP	
ADDITIC PILE 294- CONDIT	ONAL CO C NOTE ( ION RAT	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGEN	: C D:	LOSED	D (80%)/ OPE	EN (20%)	SPALL 4	4 SF X 3	3" DEEP (NO	) EXPOSE	ED REBA	R) W/CS SE CRNR AT TO	)P.	

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection To	eam l	Locat eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 1125  Tide: +4.2'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing Batter  Concrete, Timber															
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    III Insp  Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Mater  Water    Insp  III Insp  Depth      Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
295	С								Х			VC HL X 4' S FACE AT T	OP		
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS SW (	CRNR 2.5 BLW PC		
295	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W FACE 2' B	LW PC		
295	А	Х			8'				Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS SW CF	RNR 4' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X3' W/CS SE CI	RNR 2' BLW PC		
												CLEANED ML, MW & TZ	-		
296	А								Х			VC 1/16"X4' W/CS N FA	CE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 4' W FACE AT	ТОР		
296	В						Х								
296	С								Х			VC 1/16"X5' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X2' S FACE 1'	BLW PC		
ADDITIO PILE 296-	NAL CO C NOTE ( ON RATI	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGENI	VC D:	2 1/16")	X5' W FACE	AT TOP									

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1125  Tide: +4.2'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber													
	Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
297	А									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SE CRNR AT TOP	
297	В						Х							
297	С								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 4.5' W/CS S FA	ACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8" X 4' W/CS E FA	CE AT TOP	
298	C-BATT										Х	TIMBER, 80% SL ML TO	ML +4' FROM MARINE BORER (MB)	
298	С									Х		VC 1/16" X 4' SW CRNR	AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS SW CRNR 1' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8" X 4' NW CRNR 1	' BLW PC	
298	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E 2' BLW PC	
												VC HL X 3' W/CS S FACI	E 3' BLW PC	
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 1201  Tide: +4.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments															
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Vater Depth      Water Depth      Pile      Water Depth      Pile      Concrete, Timber        Bent      Pile      Image: Non-Section Rating Depth      Non-Section Rating Depth      SV      Comments														
Location  Level II Insp  Level Mater Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second Sec															
298	А	Х			7'		Х					CLEANED ML, MW & TZ			
299	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS NE CR	NR 1' BLW PC		
299	В								Х			VC HL X 2.5' W/CS W FA	ACE 2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16" X2 ' W/CS 3 FA	CE 2.5 BLW PC		
												VC HL X 1' W/CS N FAC	E 3' BLW PC		
299	С								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E 2' BLW PC		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR S FACE		
												VC 1/16" X 4' W/CS SE C	CRNR AT TOP		
300	С								Х			VC HL X 4.5' S FACE AT	ТОР		
												VC HL X 2' W/ CS N FAC	E 3' BLW PC		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke Munic ו	ley tipal Pier nspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1315  Tide: +4.9'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber    Comments  Comments  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level  Water Depth  Pile  Oncerter, Hinder    Bent  Pile  Verter  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV    300  B  NI  NI  NI  NI  NI  V/C HI X 2' W/CS S FACE 4' BI W PC														
300	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS S FAC	E 4' BLW PC	
300	A-BATT										Х	TIMBER, 95% SECTION	LOSS BTM 6'	
300	А						Х							
301	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N FACE TOP 2'	
301	В								Х			VC 1/8" X 3' W FACE AT	ТОР	
301	С			Х						Х		VC 1/4"X4.5' SE CRNR 1	BLW PC. EXIST SHOTCRETE	
												REPAIR. HC 1/4" X FUL	L FACE E FACE 2.5' BLW PC	
302	С	Х			8'					Х		VC 1/8" X 3' S FACE AT	ТОР	
												VC 1/8" X 2.5' NE CRNR	2' BLW PC	
												AND GOES INTO 1.5 SF	OPEN SPALL X 1/2" DEEP	
ADDITIC	NAL CON	<u>MMENTS:</u>												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee t 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1315  Tide: +4.9'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Insp  III Insp  Depth  III Insp  III Insp  III Insp													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MJ  SV    302  B  SV  SECRNB 2' BLW PC														
302	В								Х			VC HL X 1.5' SE CRNR	2' BLW PC	
302	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/C NW CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X3' W FACE AT 1	OP	
												CLOSED SPALL 2.5 SF 3	SE CRNR AT TOP	
303	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF NV	W CRNR AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SE CRNR	
303	В						Х					BLACK EPOXY PAINT O	N TOP 2' OF PILE	
303	С								Х			VC 1/8"X1.5' SW CRNR *	1' BLW PC.EXIST SHOTECRETE REP.	
304	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/C SE CRNR AT TOP	
												BLACK EPOXY ON ALL	FACE W FACE 2.5' BLW PC	
												VC HL X 1' S FACE 2' BI	LW PC	
	NAL CO	MMENTS:												
PILE 304-	C NOTE C	ONTINUED:	VC	C 1/2" X	2' SW CRN	R AT TOP	)							
CONDIT	ION RATI	NG LEGENI	D:											

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic	ley ;ipal Pier Inspection T	<sup>°</sup> eam l	Locati Leader	ion: Berk	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	C	Company:	Sea Er Augus <sup>1</sup>	nginee t 7, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
	Time of Day: 1347  Tide: +4.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:													
Time c	of Day: <b>13</b>	547		Tide:	+4.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
				l					Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Insp  III Insp  Depth  Ni  ND  MD  MJ  SV    Bent  Pile  Value  X  Value  X  Value    304  B  Value  X  Value  Value  Value														
304	В					I	Х							
304	Α					I			Х			VC 1/8" X 2' E FACE AT	ТОР	
						ı		 	Γ	Γ		VC 1/8" X 1.5' S FACE 3	BLW PC	
305	A								Х			VC HL X 4' W/C (IN SHO	TCRETE) N FACE AT TOP	
305	В	Х			9'	 	X							
305	С					ı	X	 	Γ	Γ				
306	C-BATT							I	Х			MARINE BORER ACTIV	ITY 25% SECTION LOSS	
306	С					 		X				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR E FACE TOP 2'	
306	В					ı	X	 	Γ	Γ				
306	Α					I			Х			VC HL X 3' W/C NE CR	NR AT TOP	
307	А					 	Х							
ADDITIC	-A NOTES	<u>IMENTS:</u> CONTINUE	D: E	EXIST 8	SHOTCRETE	EREPAIR	N, S, Al	ND W F/	ACES.					

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic ۱	ley ⊧ipal Pier Inspection ⊺	ēam	Locat	ion: Berk	eley, C oberts,	A PE	C	Company:	Sea Er 20170	nginee 807	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	Time of Day: 1415  Tide: +4.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing  Batter  Concrete  Timber													
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bast  Bits  Nine  Nine  Nine  Nine  Nine  Nine													
Location  Leven  Value  Prile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MD  MJ  SV														
307	В	,†	1			1	Х							
307	С	,t	1		1	1			Х			VC HL X 3' W FACE AT	ТОР	
		,I	1									VC 1/16" X 3' S FACE A	Т ТОР	
308	С		í			i!		·	Х			VC HL X 2.5' S FACE 1'	BLW PC	
308	В		í			i!	Х	·	T				<u>.</u>	
308	А	Х	I		7'		Х	·						
309	Α					I	Х							
309	В						Х							
309	С		I					ı		Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF SI	E FACE AT TOP	
310	C-BATT									Х		50% SECTION LOSS (S	L) BOTTOM 4' MARINE BORER (MB)	
310	С					ı			Х			VC HL X 1' W FACE 2' B	LW PC	
ADDITIC	NAL CON	<u>/MENTS:</u>												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er 201708	nginee 807	ering, Inc. Divers: F / ł	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1443  Tide: +4.3'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile  Oncrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  Image: Second Sec													
Location  Level if  Level if  Valer  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  III Insp  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
310	В								Х			VC 1/8" X 3' W/C W FAC	E 1' BLW PC	
310	А								Х			VC 1/8" X 1' SW CRNR 2	2.5 BLW PC	
311	А									Х		VC 1/8" X 2' W/C N FACE	E AT TOP	
												VC 3/8" X 3' NW CRNR /	AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1.5' W FACE A	Т ТОР	
												VC 1/8" X 1.5' SE CRNR	AT TOP	
311	В								Х			VC 1/16" X 2' SE CRNR /	AT TOP	
311	С								Х			VC 1/16" X 2.5' W/C W F.	ACE AT TOP	
312	С	Х			8'				Х			VC HL X 2' W FACE 2' BI	LW PC	
												VC HL X 16" W/C E FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/16" X 3' S FACE		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 0825  Tide: +0.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Ni  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Section Comments  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
312	В									Х		VC HL X 2" W/CS E FAC	Ε ΤΟ ΤΟΡ	
												VC HL X 2' S FACE TO T	OP	
												CORROSION STAIN W F	FACE BLW PC	
												OPEN SPALL 1 SF X 1.5	" DEEP NW CRNR 4' BLW PC	
312	А									Х		BLACK EPOXY PAINT O	N TOP 2' OF PILE	
												OPEN SPALL 2 1/4" X 1.	5" DEEP W FACE AT TOP	
												ASSOCIATED VC 1/4" X	1'	
313	А									Х		VC HL X 1' W/CS NE CR	NR AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
313	В						Х							
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 0825  Tide: +0.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Location  Level II  Level  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MJ  SV														
Location  Level II  Level Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second														
313	С									Х		OPEN SPALL 2 SF X UP	TO 4" DEEP SW CRNR 4' BLW PC	
314	С								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS SW CR	RNR TO TOP	
												VC 1/16'X1.8' W FACE 1'	BLW PC	
314	В						Х							
314	А									х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
315	А									Х		VC 1/8'X2' W/CS E FACE	E AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS NE CRNR AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS SE CRNR AT TOP	
315	В	Х			5'				Х			VC 1/16"X2' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP	
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CS S FACE	E AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk	eley, C oberts,	PE	( Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Ei Augus	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
	Time of Day: 0825  Tide: +0.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:														
Time of Day: 0825  Tide: +0.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete Timber															
	Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Depth      Water Depth      Pile      Water NI      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV      Concrete, Timber														
Location  Level II Insp  Level II III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile															
315	С								Х			VC 1/16"X3' W/CS SE C	RNR AT TOP		
316	С									Х		VC 3/8"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
316	В						Х								
316	А						Х								
317	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
317	В						Х								
317	С								Х			VC 1/16"X3' W/CS E FAG	CE AT TOP		
												VC HL X2' NW CRNR AT	TOP IN EXISTING SHOTCRETE		
												REPAIR			
												VC 1/16"X4' W/CS W FA	ACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	f Day: (){	345		Tide:	+1.0'				Pile Type Bearing	(Bearing, , Batte	Batter, S r	Sheet):	<sup>Pile Material:</sup> Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second Sec														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Ni  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
318	С									Х		VC 1/16"X2' W/CS S FAC	CE AT TOP		
												2X VC 1/16"X2' W/CS SV	V CRNR AT TOP		
												VC 3/8"X2.5' 2/CS W FA	CE AT TOP		
318	В						Х								
318	А	Х			5'				Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS NW CF	RNR AT TOP		
319	А								Х			VC 1/16"X2' W/CS NW C	RNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X2' W/CS W FA	ACE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 3' W/CS SE CR	NR AT TOP		
319	В						Х								
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

<sup>Structure:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam Le	Location: Be eader: Paul I	rkeley, ( Roberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Ei Augus	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton			
Time of Day: 08	845		Tide: +1.0'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:			
							Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber			
Location	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile  Water  Depth    Bent  Pile  V  V  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Bent Pile	Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    319  C  C  Vider  X  EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR N & W FACE 2' BLW TOP													
319 C							Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N & W FACE 2' BLW TOP			
										VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP			
										VC HL X 1' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP			
										VC 1/4"X2 W/CS SE CR	NR AT TOP			
320 C								Х		VC 3/8"X4' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP			
										VC 1/4"X1.5' S FACE AT	ТОР			
										VC HL X 2.5" W/CS W F.	ACE AT TOP			
										VC 1/8"X3' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP			
320 B							Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP			
320 A							Х			VC 1/8"X2 W/CS N FACI	Ε ΑΤ ΤΟΡ			
										VC 1/4"X3' W/CS NW C	RNR AT TOP			
ADDITIONAL CON PILE 320-A NOTE C CONDITION RATI	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGENI	VC D:	1/8"X3' W/CS S	W CRNR A	T TOP									

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	e: Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	f Day: 09	25		Tide:	+1.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Section Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV    220  A PATE  Image: Section Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Leven  Leven  Water  Prile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second Matrix														
320	A-BATT								Х			20% SECTION LOSS FR	OM MARINE BORER AT MUDLINE		
321	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W FACE AT	ГОР		
321	В						Х								
321	С								Х			VC HL X 2.5' W/CS & EF	F S FACE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS SE C	RNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS W F	ACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CS SW CR	RNR AT TOP		
322	С	Х			6'					Х		VC 3/8X4' W FACE AT T	OP		
												OPEN SPALL 3 SF X 2"	DEEP SE CRNR 4 ' BLW PC		
322	В						Х								
ADDITIC	DNAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	œam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 09	25		Tide:	+1.6'				Pile Type Bearing	(Bearing,	Batter, S r	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    322  A  V  V  V  V  V														
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
322	A						X		mb	1010				
323	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS NE CR	NR AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS W F	ACE AT TOP	
323	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
323	С								Х			VC 1/4"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS SE C	RNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
324	С								Х			VC 1/8"X4' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SW FACE TOP 2'	
324	В						Х							
324	А						Х							
ADDITIC	NAL COI	<u>MMENTS:</u>												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	e: Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	of Day: 09	50		Tide:	+2.1'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  V  V  V    324  A-BATT  V  V  V													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
324	A-BATT										Х	90% SECTION LOSS BT	M 6'	
325	А									Х		VC HL X 2' W/CS NE CR	NR AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
												VC HL X 2' S FACE AT T	OP	
325	В	Х			7'		Х							
325	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE S F	ACE TOP 2'	
												VC 1/4'X3' W/CS SW CR	NR AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS SE CR	NR AT TOP	
												VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W FACE 2'	BLW PC	
	DNAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 117	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 09	950		Tide:	+2.1'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Insp  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
326	С								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP	
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS W FA	ACE AT TOP	
326	В								Х			VC 1/8"X1.5' W FACE 2'	BLW PC	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS N FAC	E 3' BLW PC	
326	А								Х			VC 1/8"X2.5' W/CS N FA	CE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' W/CS W FA	ACE AT TOP	
327	А								Х			VC 1/16"X4' W/CS E FA0	CE AT TOP	
												VC HL X 4' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
327	В								Х			VC HL X 2.5' W/EFF NW	CRNR AT TOP	
327	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SW CRNR TOP 2'	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
ADDITIC PILE 327	C NOTES	MMENTS: CONTINUE	D:2	VC 1/8	8"X3' W/CS S	FACE A	TTOP.	VC 1/4".	X2.5' W/CS	SE CRNR	AT TOP	. VC 1/8"X2' E FACE AT T	OP	
NI = Not	inspected	l, inaccessib	le											

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	f Day: 10	)18		Tide:	+2.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    328  C  V  X  V  V  V														
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile    Insp  III Insp  Depth      Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV															
328	С						Х								
328	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1.5' W FACE 1	' BLW PC		
328	А	Х			7'		Х								
329	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS NE CR	NR AT TOP		
												VC HL X 3' S FACE AT T	OP		
329	В						Х								
329	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	/CS SW CRNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FACE	Ε ΑΤ ΤΟΡ		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / )17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	of Day: 1(	018		Tide:	+2.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile    Insp  III Insp  Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    330  C  C  C  C  C  C  C														
330	С									Х		VC HL X 3' W/CS & EFF	S FACE AT TOP		
												OPEN SPALL 1.5 SF X 1	.5" DEEP S FACE 1' BLW PC		
												CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS SE CRNR AT TOP		
												VC HL X 1' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2' W/CS & EEF	W FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X2' W/CS W FA	CE 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/6"X3' W/CS NW CF	RNR AT TOP		
330	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS E FAC	E 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X4' W/CS NW C	RNR AT TOP		
												VC HL X 1.5' W/CS SW (	CRNR 1.5' BLW PC		
330	А							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS N FACE 1' BLW PC		
ADDITIC PILE 330	A NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGEN	E> D:	KIST SH	HOTCRETE	REPAIR V	V/CS W	FACE T	TOP 2'. VC	HL X 1' W/	CS W FA	ACE 1' BLW PC			
NI = Not	inspected	l, inaccessib	le												

ND = No Deterioration/Damage MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: <b>11</b>	10		Tide:	+3.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    331  A  V  X  V  V  V													
Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    331  A  X  X  X  X  X														
331	А						Х							
331	В								Х			VC HL X 1.5' W/CS N FA	CE 2' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' NW CRNR 2	2' BLW PC	
331	С								Х			VC 1/8"X4.5' W/CS S FA	CE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
332	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS NE CR	NR AT TOP	
												2 VC HL X 3' W/CS E FA	CE AT TOP	
332	В								Х			VC HL X 1.5' W/CS N FA	CE 2' BLW PC	
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 117	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	of Day: <b>11</b>	10		Tide:	+3.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Ni      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating      Comments        Bent      Pile      Image: Second Secon													
Bent	Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    332  C  X  7'  X  3 VC HL X 3' W/CS & EFF E FACE AT TOP													
332	Bent      Pile      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV        332      C      X      7'      X      X      3VC HL X 3' W/CS & EFF E FACE AT TOP													
												VC 1/16"X3' W/CS N FAC	CE AT TOP	
												20" SQUARE PILE W/ 1"	CHAMFEVED CRNRS	
333	А						Х							
333	В						Х					BLACK EPOXY PAINT A	T TOP	
333	С									Х		VC 1/8"/2' W FACE 2.5' E	BLW PC	
												VC1/8"X2.5' W/CS 1' BLV	N PC	
												VC 1/8"X3' SE FACE AT	ТОР	
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS N FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS N FA	CE 2' BLW PC	
333	C-BATT									Х		50% SECTION LOSS BT	M 6' DUE TO MARINE BORER	
ADDITIC	C CONTIN	MENTS:	: 2 <sup>v</sup>	VC HL	X 3' W/CS W	/ FACE A	T TOP. \	/C 1/16	"X3' S FACE	AT TOP.	VC 1/8">	(3' S FACE AT TOP		
NI = Not	inspected	, inaccessib	le											
ND = No	Deteriora	tion/Damage	Э											

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers:	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	f Day: 1	10		Tide:	+3.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location    Level II Insp    Level III Insp    Water Depth    Pile Condition Rating    Comments      Bent    Pile    Image: Second														
334	С							Х				EXIST SHOTECRETE R	EPAIR W FACE TOP 2'		
334	В								Х			BLACK EPOXY PAINT A	AT TOP		
												VC HL X 3' S FACE AT 1	ГОР		
334	А						Х								
335	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	//CS NW FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' E FACE 2.5	5' BLW PC		
335	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1.5' SW FACE	2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X4' SE FACE AT	ТОР		
335	С								Х			VC HL X 2.5' S FACE AT	ГТОР		
336	С								Х			BLACK EPOXY PAINT A	АТ ТОР		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP		
ADDITIC PILE 336-	C NOTE	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: E)	XIST SI	HOTCRETE	REPAIR S	8 & W F/	ACE AT	TOP. VC 1/	8" X 3.5' V	V/CS W F	FACE 1' BLW PC			
	inonostor		0. Jo												

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic ۱	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	f Day: 12	13		Tide:	+4.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Insp  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
336	В								Х			BLACK EPOXY PAINT A	Т ТОР	
												VC HL X 1.5' W FACE 1.5	5' BLW PC	
336	А	Х			7'		Х							
336	A-BATT										Х	100% SECTION LOSS (S	SL) BLW TOP	
337	А								Х			VC HL X 1' E FCAE 2.5 E	3LW TOP	
337	В						Х							
337	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS W FACE 0.5' BLW PC	
338	C-BATT										Х	BROKEN AND HOLLOW	FROM TOP TO MUDLINE (ML)	
338	С									Х		OPEN SPALL 1 SF W/CS	S W FACE 1' BLW PC	
												CLOSED SPALL 0.5' SF	W/CS SW CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W FACE AT	ТОР	
ADDITIC	DNAL COM	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic	ley ;ipal Pier Inspection T	- Team I	Locati Leader	ion: Berk	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	C	Company:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: [ / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
	Time of Day: $1254$ Tide: $\pm 4.0^{1}$ Pile Type (Bearing Batter Sheet): Pile Material:														
Time c	Time of Day: 1254  Tide: +4.9'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Rearing  Rearing  Reatter  Concrete  Timber														
Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber													Concrete, Timber		
Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Bile  NI  ND  MI  SV															
Insp  III Insp  Depth    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV															
338	В	ii				1	Х								
338	А	ii				1		i	Х			VC 1/8"X0.5' N FACE AT	ТОР		
339	А		1			i I	Х	1	1			PIECE OF REBAR HANC	GING FROM DECK UNDERSIDE		
339	В		Í			ı ı	Х	í	1						
339	С	i!	I					1		Х		OPEN (40%) / CLOSED	(60%) SPALL 3 SF 1.5" DEEP W/CS		
												SE FACE AT TOP			
340	С	Х			6'			1	Х			VC 1/16"X2' W/CS S FAC	CE AT TOP		
		ı				I						VC HL X 2' S FACE 1' BL	_W PC		
340	В	!	Ē				X								
340	А	ı				I			Х			VC HL X 2.5' W FACE A	ТТОР		
340	A-BATT	ı	Ē			I					X	75% SECTION LOSS 3'	ABOVE MUDLINE		
ADDITIC	<u>)NAL CON</u>	<u>/MENTS:</u>													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1254  Tide: +4.9'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location    Level II Insp    Level N    Water Depth    Pile Condition Rating Depth    Concrete, Timber      Bent    Pile													
Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  III  NI  NI  MD  MJ  SV														
341	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS NW CRNR 1' BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X2.5' W FACE 2	' BLW PC	
341	В								Х			VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS W FA	CE 2' BLW PC	
341	С									Х		VC 1/16"X2' W/CS N FAC	CE 2.5 BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X1' W FACE 2.5	5' BLW PC	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E FACE TOP 3' W/	
												CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	/CS E FACE AT TOP	
342	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS SE CRNR AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 4 SF W	/CS E FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X1' W FACE AT	ТОР	
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS SW C	RNR 3' BLW PC	
	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	: Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Ei Augus	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
	ime of Day: 1322 Tide: +5.0' Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Pile Material: Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber														
Time o	f Day: 13	322		Tide:	+5.0'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
	Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber    Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Bating  Comments														
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
342	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1' W/CS N FA	CE 2.5' BLW PC		
342	А							Х				3" DIA AREA OF CS N F	ACE 1' BLW PC		
343	А								Х			VC HL X 3.5' W/CS W FA	ACE AT TOP		
343	В	Х			7'					Х		OPEN SPALL 1.5 SF X 1	.5" DEEP W/CR 4' BLW PC		
343	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CR SE CRNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X3' S FACE 1' E	BLW PC		
												CLOSED SPALL HL X 2.	5" W/CR SE CRNR AT BTM. CRACK		
344	С							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR E FACE		
344	В								Х			VC HL X 1.5' E FACE AT	ТОР		
												VC HL X 2' E FACE 2' BL	W PC		
344	А						Х								
ADDITIC PILE 343-	C NOTE C	MMENTS: Cotinued: .	VC	HL X 2	.5' W/CS SE	CRNR A1	BTM O	F CLOS	SED SPALL						

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1322  Tide: +5.0'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Description  Restrict  Concrete  Timber													
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location    Level II Insp    Level II III Insp    Water Depth    Pile    Water Depth    Pile    Water NI    NI    ND    MD    MJ    SV    Concrete, Timber													
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Insp  III Insp  Depth  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
345	А								Х			VC 1/16"X3' W/CR E FCA	AE AT TOP	
												1/8"X3' W/CR E FACE 2.	5' BLW PC	
												CS 3"X6" E FACE 3' BLW	/ PC	
345	В								Х			VC 1/8"X3' W/CR NW CF	RNR AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1.5' E FACE AT	ТОР	
345	С									Х		VC HL X 1' W FACE 2.5'	BLW PC	
												VC HL X 1' W FACE 3' B	LW PC	
												VC 1/16"X2' SW CRNR 2	BLW PC	
												VC HL X 2.5' S FACE 1' E	BLW PC	
												OPEN SPALL 1.5 SF X 1	.5" DEEP W/CR E FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CR E FACI	E AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier		Locat	ion: Berk	eley, C	A	C	Company:	Sea Er	nginee	ering, Inc. Divers: F	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez		
	Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE    Inspection Date: August 8. 2017    N. Walton      "ime of Day: 1404    Tide: +5.0'    Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):    Pile Material:      Day: 1404    Tide: +5.0'    Day: Day    Pile Material:														
Time o	f Day: <b>1</b> 4	04		Tide:	+5.0'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Comment Structure  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    346  C  Image: Comment Structure															
346	С						Х								
346	В						Х								
346	А	Х			7'					Х		CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF S	S FACE 1' BLW PC		
347	А									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR N & W FACE TOP 3'		
												CLOSED SPALL 2 SF AT	T REPAIR		
347	В						Х								
347	С								Х			VC 1/8"X3.5' W/CR S FA	CE AT TOP		
348	С								Х			VC 1/16"X3' W FACE AT	ТОР		
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CR S FA	CE AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CR SE CR	NR AT TOP		
348	В						Х								
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	e: Berke Munic	ley ipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 8. 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 1442  Tide: +4.7'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments															
Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  V  NI  ND  MJ  SV															
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV    348  A  VC 1/8"X3' W/CR N FACE AT TOP														
348	А								Х			VC 1/8"X3' W/CR N FAC	E AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR N & W FACE W/CS & CRACK		
349	А							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR		
349	В								Х			VC 1/16"X2.5' W/CR E F/	ACE 1.5' BLW PC		
349	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR NW & W FACE TOP 3' W/		
												VC 1/16"X1' W FACE. VC	C 1/16"X1.5' N FACE 2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X1' W FACE			
												VC 1/16"X1.5' N FACE 2'	BLW PC		
349	C-BATT							Х				CHECKS UP TO 1/2" W			
349	С	Х			8'				Х			VC HL X 2' W/CR E FAC	E AT TOP		
ADDITIC	DNAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection To	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	XA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	f Day: 08	344		Tide:	+0.5'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber														
Loca	ation	Level II Insp	Le III I	evel nsp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ting			Comments		
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    350  B  SV  X  EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR N & E FACE AT TOP														
350	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N & E FACE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
350	А								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC HL X 3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1.5" W/CS NW	CRNR AT TOP		
351	А								Х			VC HL X 2.5" W/CS N FA	ACE AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NW CRNR AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS W FA	ACE AT TOP		
351	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS NW CF	RNR 1' BLW PC		
351	С								Х			VC 1/8" X3' W/CS W FAG	CE AT TOP		
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:													
PILE 351-	C NOTE (	CONTINUED:	V0	C 1/8"X	2' W FACE 1	.5' BLW P	C								
CONDIT	ION RATI	NG LEGENI	D:												

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic	ley ipal Pier	Team	Locat Leader	. <sup>ion:</sup> Berk .: Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	of Day: 08	44	·,	Tide:	+0.5'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, ٤	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
			ļ						Bearing	j, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile  Pile  Water  Depth    Bent  Pile  Image  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level if  Level if  Valer  Prile Condition Rating  Comments    Insp  III Insp  Depth  Ni  ND  MN  MJ  SV														
352	С	·				1				Х		CLOSED SPALL 1SF E	FACE AT TOP	
		·				1						VC 1/8"X2.5' W FACE A	ГТОР	
352	В	·i			i – – †	1			Х		1	VC 1/16"X1' SW CRNR 2	2' BLW PC	
		·i			i – – †	1		i				VC 1/16"X2.5' W/CS W F	ACE AT TOP	
352	А	·i				i i	Х							
352	A-BATT	,			1 I	i I				1	Х	TIMBER BROKEN 5' BL	N PC	
352	А	1			1	1	Х	1						
353	В	Х			6'	l l	Х	1						
353	С	1			1	l l		Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SE, SW & S FACE W/CS TOP 2'	
354	C-BATT					ı ı		Х		1		1/2" CHECKING ABOVE	WATER	
354	С							·		Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS SE CRNR AT TOP	
ADDITIC	DINAL CON	MENTS:	): V	C 1/4"X	(1.5' W/CS SI	E CRNR §	STARTIN	NG AT E	TM OF SP/					

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 0904  Tide: +0.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water UII Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
354	B						X			1110				
354	А						Х							
355	А								Х			VC HL X 3' W/EFF SW C	RNR AT TOP	
355	В						Х							
355	С								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP	
												2 VC HL X 2.5' W/CS S F	ACE AT TOP	
												VC HL X 2' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP	
356	С								Х			VC 1/4"X4' W/CS S FACE	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1.5' W/CS SW 0	CRNR 2' BLW PC	
356	В								Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS SW CF	RNR 2.5' BLW PC	
356	А	Х			5'				Х			VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS N F	ACE AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	Time of Day: 0904  Tide: +0.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Descriper: Detter  Conserve Timber														
	Indel +0.0  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter).  Pile Material.    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Index +0.0  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet).    Location  Level II  Level Water    Bent  Pile    Bent  Pile    NI  ND  MN    MD  MJ    SV														
Bent	Time of Day: 0904  Tide: +0.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    357  A  Image: Addition of the state of the sta														
357	А						Х								
357	В						Х								
357	С								Х			VC 1/8"X4' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NW CRNR		
												VC HL X 1' W/CS NW CI	RNR		
												VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	CE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
358	С								Х			VC 1/16"/2' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SE CRNR AT TOP		
												VC HL X 1' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC HL X 1.5' W FACE A	T TOP		
ADDITIC PILE 358 CONDIT	ONAL CO C NOTE ( ION RATI	MMENTS: CONTINUED	:VC D:	C 1/8"X2	2' W/CS W F.	ACE 6" BL	WPC (	SHOTC	RETE). EX	ST SHOT	CRETE I	REPAIR SW CRNR 1' BLV	V PC		

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0904  Tide: +0.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Bating  Comments														
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Vater III Insp      Water Depth      Pile      Water Vater      Pile      Water Vater      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV      Concrete, Timber														
Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV															
358	В									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS SE CRNE AT TOP		
												2 VCS 1/16"X1' W/CS E I	FACE 1.5' BLW PC		
358	А			Х					Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR S & E FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"/3' W/CS E FACE	AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W FACE AT	ТОР		
359	А								Х			2 VC HL X 2' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2' S FACE AT T	OP		
359	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE W/C	CS S & SW FACE		
												OPEN SPALL 4" DIA X 2	" DEEP 4' BLW PC		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 09	04		Tide:	+0.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
	Interview  Price Type (beams, batter)    Interview  Price Type (beams, batter)    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II    Level II  Level Water    Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	ation	Level II Insp	Le III I	evel Insp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ting			Comments	
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv			
359	С								Х			VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS W FAC	CE AT TOP	
360	А						Х							
360	В						Х							
360	С	Х			5'				Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FAC	E 1' BLW PC	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SW & W FACE AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS W FAC	CE AT TOP	
361	С									Х		VC HL X 2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1/4 SF	SE CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS SE CR	NR BLW SPALL	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	EPAIR SE & S FACE TOP 2'	
ADDITIC PILE 361- CONDIT	ONAL CO C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: V( D:	C 1/8" >	( 2' W/CS S I	FACE AT	TOP. VO	C 1/4"X3	8' W/CS W F	ACE AT T	OP			

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage
Structure	e: Berke Munic	eley Cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	of Day: 09	004		Tide:	+0.8'				Pile Type Bearing	(Bearing, I, Batte	Batter, S r	Sheet):	<sup>Pile Material:</sup> Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Insp  III Insp  Depth  NI  ND  MJ  SV														
361	В								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS SW CF	RNR 2' BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS W F	ACE 2' BLW PC	
361	А								Х			VC 1/16"X3' W/CS E FAC	CE AT TOP	
362	А								Х			VC HL X 1.5' W/CS N FA	CE AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W FACE TOP 2'	
362	В						х							
362	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS SW CRNR 0.5' BLW PC	
362	C-BATT										Х	90% SECTION LOSS (SI	L) AT BTM. 95% SL TZ	
363	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE W/0	CS S & SE FACE TOP 2'	
												VC 1/6"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS SW FA	CE AT TOP	
ADDITIC PILE 363 CONDIT	ONAL COL -C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGENI	: V( D:	C 1/8"X	3' W/CS SE	FACE AT	TOP. VO	CHLX	2' W/CS E F	ACE AT T	OP			

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat _eader:	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 0904  Tide: +0.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing  Batter  Concrete  Timber													
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Vater III Insp      Water Depth      Pile      Concrete, Timber        Bent      Pile													
Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second														
363	В						Х							
363	А								Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS E FACI	E 3' BLW PC	
364	А	Х			5'					Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR W/CS N, NW & W TOP 2'	
												VC 1/8'X1.5' W/CS N FAG	CE AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
364	В								Х			VC HL X 1.5' W/CS NE C	RNR AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
364	С								Х			VC 1/16"X4' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E FACE TOP 1.5'	
												VC 1/16"X1.5' E FACE A	T TOP (IN SHOTCRETE)	
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS & EF	F S FACE AT TOP	
<u>ADDITIC</u>	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>tion:</sup> Berk	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 09	04		Tide:	+0.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
	Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level  Water Depth  Pile  Oncident, Fille    Bent  Pile  Ville  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location    Level II Insp    Level III Insp    Water Depth    Pile Condition Rating    Comments      Bent    Pile    III    NI    ND    MN    MD    MJ    SV      365    C    IE    IE    IE    X    IE    EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR E FACE TOP 2'														
365	С							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR E FACE TOP 2'	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS W FACE TOP 2' & HL VC	
365	В								Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS S FAC	E BLW PC	
												VC HL X 0.5' W FACE 2'	BLW PC	
												SLIGHT BATTER DOWN	I TO SW	
365	А							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NW & W FACE W/CS TOP 2'	
366	А						Х							
366	В								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	CE 2' BLW PC	
366	С								Х			VC 1/8"X1' W/CS N FAC	E 2' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SW CRNR TOP 2.5'	
ADDITIC PILE 366-	C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: V(	C 1/5"X	2' W/CS E F/	ACE AT T	OP. CL	OSE SF	PALL 2 SF V	V/CS 1' BL	W PC (II	N SHOTCRETE)		
CONDIT NI = Not	ION RATI	NG LEGEN , inaccessib	D: le											

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	œam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1038  Tide: +2.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber													
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  V  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
367	С							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS S,SW,SE & E FACE TOP4'	
367	В	Х			6'					Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
367	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NW & N FACE	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS W FACE	
												VC HL X 1.5' W/CS NW 0	CRNR BLW SHOTCRETE	
368	А								Х			VC 1/8"X4' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/4"X4' W/CS NW CF	RNRN AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' S FACE 2' E	BLW PC	
368	В						Х							
368	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/VC S, SE & E FACE TOP 2'	
												W/ HL VC. VC HL X 3' W	/CS E FACE AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	<u>MMENTS:</u>												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure:	Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam I	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	PE	( Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of	Day: 11	17		Tide:	+3.3'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Locat	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Bent	Location  Leven  Valer    Insp  III Insp  Depth													
369	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR S, SF & E FACE	
												VC HL X 3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1' W FACE 2' B	LW PC	
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS NW CF	RNR 2.5' BLE PC	
369	В								Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS 4' BLW	/ PC	
369	А								Х			VC 1/4"X4.5' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X2.5' W/CS NE	CRNR AT TOP	
370	А								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E 2' BLW PC	
370	В							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS W FACE	
370	С	Х			7'				Х			VC HL X 3.5' W/CS NE C	RNR AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SE CRNR AT TOP	
ADDITION PILE 370-0	NAL COL NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	VC	C 1/16"X	(2' W/CS S F	ACE AT 1	ΓΟΡ							

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	: Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / )17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: <b>1</b> 1	17		Tide:	+3.3'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Network  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  V  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV    371  C  V  V  V  EVIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR NESS, SE & SW FACES TOP 3'														
371	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NE, S, SE & SW FACES TOP 3'	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' W/CR SW 0	CRNR 1.5' BLW PC	
371	В						Х							
371	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR S, SW & W FACES TOP 2.5'	
												VC 1/2"X2.5' W FACE AT	ГТОР	
372	А						Х							
372	В							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W FACE	
372	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SE CRNR TOP 3'	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' S FACE 0.5	BLW PC	
												VC 3/16"X2' W FACE 1' I	3LW PC	
373	С							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR S, SW FACES AT TOP	
ADDITIO PILE 373- CONDIT	C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	: V(	C 1/8"X	2' W/CR S F/	ACE AT T	OP							

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley ipal Pier	-	Locat	ion: Berk	eley, C	A DE	(	Company:	Sea Er	nginee	ering, Inc. Divers: [	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
	I	nspection T	eam I	Leader		obens,	PE	Inspec	tion Date:	August	t 9, 20	)17		
Time o	f Day: 12	58		Tide:	+4.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
373	В								Х			VC HL X 1.5' W/EFF W F	ACE 0.5' BLW PC	
373	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS W FACE AT TOP	
374	А								Х			4 VC 1/16"X3"-6" E FACE	E 2' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
374	В						Х							
374	С	Х			6'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SE CRNR	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR S FACE 1' BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X2.5'		
374	C-BATT									Х		50% SECTION LOSS 3'	OVER MUDLINE (ML)	
375	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/VC 1/4"X4' W FACE AT TOP	
375	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR S, SE, E FACES 2.5' BLW PC	
ADDITIC	DNAL CON B NOTE C	MENTS: ONTINUED:	: VC		3' E FACE A		ѕнотс	RETE						

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier nspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 12	58		Tide:	+4.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
375	А							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W FACE 1.5' BLW PC	
376	A-BATT										Х	95% SECTION LOSS (SI	L) 3' BLW PC	
376	А								Х			VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
376	В							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS N, NW & W FACES	
376	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SW TO N FACE	
												AT TOP. VC 1/4"X3.5' SV	N FACE	
												CRACK IN SHOTCRETE	AT TOP	
												PILE IS ROTATED 45 DE	EGREE	
377	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF SV	N FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X2.5' S FACE 1'	BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' SW CRNR	AT TOP	
ADDITIC PILE 377- CONDIT	ONAL COM C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGENI	VC D:	C 1/8"X	2' W FACE 1	.5' BLW P	РС							

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers:   / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 1321  Tide: +5.0'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water UII Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV    377  B  X  6'  X  EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR W FACE 1.5' BLW PC														
377	В	Х			6'			Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W FACE 1.5' BLW PC		
377	А								Х			VC 1/4"X2.5 W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X0.5' W/CS NW (	CRNR 2' BLW PC		
378	А								Х			VC 1/4"X2' W FACE AT	ГОР		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N FACE 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X3' W/CS IN SH	IOTCRETE		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS			
378	В						Х								
378	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR E, SE & S FACES 4' BLW PC		
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF S	FACE 1.5 BLW PC		
379	С								Х			VC HL X 3' W/CS & EFF	LORESCENCE (EFF) S FACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic ۱	ley ipal Pier nspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspect	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	f Day: 13	47		Tide:	+5.2'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Vater Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Comments    Bent  Pile  Vater  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
Level in Insp  Level in Level in Depth  Valer Depth  Prile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
379	В						Х							
379	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE NW	CRNR	
												VC 1/16"X3' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X2.5' W/CS & EI	FF E FACE AT TOP	
380	A-BATT										Х	60% SL MARINE BOREF	R DAMAGE FROM ML TO ML +2'	
380	А						Х							
380	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1' W/CS E FAC	CE 1' BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X0.5' W FACE 2	.5' BLW PC	
380	С	Х			6'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SW FACE TOP 2' EXTENDS	
												TO W FACE AND 1.5 S F	ACE	
												VC 1/8"X3.5' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP IN SHOTECRETE	
ADDITIC PILE 380-	ONAL CON C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: V(	C 1/16"2	X1' W FACE	2.5' BLW	PC							

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 1347  Tide: +5.2'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  V  V    381  C  V  V  X  EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR SE, S & E FACES														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Mater Depth  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  Value    381  C														
381	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SE, S & E FACES		
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS S FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CS E FACE	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' SW CRNR 2	2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X1 W FACE 1' B	BLW PC		
												1/16"X1' W FACE 2.5 BL	WPC		
381	В						Х								
381	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR NW, W & N FACES		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS N FACI	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W FACE AT 1	ГОР		
382	А						Х								
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»:</sup> Berke Munic ۱	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 17 k	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1423  Tide: +5.2'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Depth  Water Depth    Bent  Pile  V  V														
382	В								Х			VC 1/8"X2.5' W/CS E FAC	CE 1' BLW PC	
382	С							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE REF	PAIR W/CS E FACE TOP 2'	
382	C-BATT									Х		40% SL. MARINE BORE	R ACTIVITY BLW WATER LINE (WL)	
383	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REP	PAIR SW CRNR	
												CLOSED SPALL 1' BLW	PC	
383	В						Х							
383	А						Х							
384	A-BATT										Х	90% SECTION LOSS 4' E	BLW PC	
384	А	Х			7'				Х			VC 1/16"X2' E FACE 1.5	BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS NE CRI	NR 1.5 BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X1' NE CRNR 2.	5 BLW PC	
ADDITIC	ONAL COM	<u>MMENTS:</u>												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 9, 20	ering, Inc. Divers: F / /17	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 1423  Tide: +5.2'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Description  Description  Description														
Intervel II  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments															
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Vater III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Stress of the stress														
384	В								Х			VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E 2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CS NE FAG	CE AT TOP		
384	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E, SE, S, SW FACES AT TOP		
												CLOSED SPALL 1/8"X1'	W/CS E FACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	<u>MMENTS:</u>													
OONDIT			-												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 0855  Tide: +0.7'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing Batter  Concrete, Timber													
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location    Level II Insp    Level II III Insp    Water Depth    Pile Condition Rating    Comments      Bent    Pile													
Location  Level II  Level Ni  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: State														
385	А						Х							
385	В						Х							
385	С							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR W FACE TOP 2'	
												CS E FACE 2' BLW TOP		
386	С			Х					Х			VC 1/16"X1' SW CRNR A	AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E FACE	
												CS SE CRNR 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X1' N FACE AT T	OP	
386	В								Х			CS E FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1' W FACE AT 1	TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' NW CRNR	AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Ei Augus	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of	Time of Day: 0855  Tide: +0.7'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Time of Day:  0855  Tide:  +0.7'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV    386  A  NU  NI  ND  MJ  SV														
386	А								Х			VC 1/8"/1' NW CRNR 1'	BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X0.5' W/CS N FA	CE 1' BLW PC		
387	А									Х		VC 1/8"X2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/2"X1.5' NW CRNR	AT TOP		
387	В	Х			6'				Х			VC 1/16"X1' NE CRNR 0	.5' BLW PC		
387	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS S FACE		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W FACE 1.	5 BLW PC		
388	С								Х			VC 1/16"X2' S FACE AT	ТОР		
388	В							Х				CS W FACE AT TOP			
388	А							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE W/	CS N FACE & NW CRNR		
ADDITIO PILE 388-,	NAL COL A NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	V(	C 1/8"X	1' N FACE 1'	BLW PC									

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F A 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0855  Tide: +0.7'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Location    Level II Insp    Level II III Insp    Water Depth    Pile Condition Rating    Comments      Bent    Pile    V    V    NI    ND    MD    MJ    SV														
Location      Level II Insp      Level Water Depth      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating      Comments        Bent      Pile      III      NI      NI      MD      MJ      SV															
389	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E & W FACES W/CS		
												CS SE CRNR AT TOP			
												VC 1/8"X0.5' W/CS N FA	CE 1.5' BLW PC		
389	В								Х			CS S FACE			
												VC 1/8"X1' SW CRNR 0.5	5 BLW PC		
389	А								Х			VC 1/8"1' W FACE 1' BLV	N PC		
390	А								Х			VC 1/8"X1' W/CS NW CR	RNR AT TOP		
												CS W FACE			
390	В								Х			VC 1/8"X1' W FACE 2' BI	LW PC		
390	С	Х			5'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR S & E FACES		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS E FA	CE AT TOP		
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	Time of Day: 0855  Tide: +0.7'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Value III Insp      Water Depth      Pile      Value Concrete, Timber      Concrete, Timber        Bent      Pile      Level Value      NI      NI      NI      MD      MJ      SV														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile  Pile  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Sector Sec														
390	C-BATT										Х	90% SECTION LOSS (SI	L) 10' BLW PC		
391	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR S & W FACES		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS S FACI	E 0.5 BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X8" W FACE 1'	BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X05' W FACE 1.	5' BLW PC		
391	В							Х				CS NW CRNR & N FACE			
391	А							Х				CS W FACE			
392	А							Х				CS E & W FACES			
392	A-BATT								Х			10% SECTION LOSS (SI	L) AT MARINE BORER		
392	В									Х		OPEN SPALL 3" DIA X 2	" DEEP NW CRNR 1.5' BLW PC		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W FACE		
ADDITIC	-B NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	V(	C 1/16"2	X0.5' S FACE	E AT TOP.	. VC 1/8	5"X2' W/	CS E FACE	AT TOP.					

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	: Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0920  Tide: +1.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Vater III Insp      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating      Comments        Bent      Pile      Vater      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV      Concrete, Timber														
Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  III Insp  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV															
392	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR S, SW & W FACES		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FACE	E AT TOP		
393	С								Х			VC 1/8"X0.5' SE CRNR 1	' BLW PC		
393	В								Х			VC 1/8"X2 W FACE 0.5' E	3LW PC		
												CS N FACE			
393	А								Х			CS S & N FACES AT TO	P		
												VC 1/16"X8" W FACE 1' I	BLW PC		
394	А	Х			6'				Х			CS N FACE AT TOP			
												VC 1/4"X1' E FACE AT T	OP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR W/CS SW CRNR		
394	В							Х				CS E FACE AT TOP			
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	Time of Day: 0920  Tide: +1.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
L	Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Time of Day: 0920  Tide: +1.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Material:  Comments    394  C  VC  VC  VC														
Bent	Time of Day: 0920  Tide: +1.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    394  C  C  NI  ND  X  VC HL X 1.5' E FACE 1' BLW PC    C  C  C  C  C  C  C														
394	С								Х			VC HL X 1.5' E FACE 1'	BLW PC		
												CS W/REMANENT SHO	TCRETE W FACE		
												CS S FACE			
394	C-BATT										Х	95% SECTION LOSS (S	L) 10' BLW PC		
395	С								Х			VC HL X 1.5' W/CS & EF	F SW CRNR AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2' W/EFF S FA	CE 0.5' BLW PC		
												CS SE CRNR			
												VC 1/16"X1' W FACE 1' I	BLW PC		
395	В							Х				CS W & N FACES			
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS N FAC	E 0.5' BLW PC		
395	А								Х			CS W & E FACES IN SP	LASH ZONE (SZ)		
ADDITIC PILE 395 CONDIT	A NOTE C	MMENTS: ONTINUED: NG LEGEN	VC D:	C 1/8"X	1' W/CS N F/	ACE AT T	OP. EXI	ST SHC	DTCRETE R	EPAIR NE	8 N FA	CES			

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0920  Tide: +1.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location      Level II Insp      Level II III Insp      Water Depth      Pile      Comments        Bent      Pile      Image: Comments in the pile      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV														
396	А							Х				CS N,W & NW FACES IN	I SZ		
396	В						Х								
396	С								Х			VC 1/4"X1.5' W/CS S FA	CE AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR W/CS SW CRNR		
												VC 1/4"X2' W/CS W FAC	E 1' BLW PC		
397	С								Х			VC HL X1.5' W/CS S FAC	CE AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR NE CRNR		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/EFF E FAC	CE 0.5 BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X1' E FACE 0.5 B	BLW PC		
												VC HL X 1' N FACE 0.5 E	BLW PC		
												VC 1/4"X2' NW CRNR A1	ГТОР		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	f Day: 09	948		Tide:	+1.6'				Pile Type Bearing	(Bearing, I, Batte	Batter, \$ r	Sheet):	<sup>Pile Material:</sup> Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Imme or Day: 0948  Inde: + 1.0  Prile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sneet):  Prile Material:    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    397  B  X  5'  X  X  CS S & W FACES														
Bent	Location      Level II      Level Depth      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating      Comments        Bent      Pile      Image: Nime Comments      Nime Comments      Nime Comments														
397	В	Х			5'				Х			CS S & W FACES			
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NE & E FACES		
												VC 1/8"X0.5' E FACE 2'	BLW PC		
												VC 1/4"X2' W FACE 2' B	LW PC (GOES INTO MB)		
397	А								Х			VC 1/4"X2' W FACE 1' B	LW PC (GOES INTO MB)		
												CS NW CRNR			
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NW & W FACES		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS SE C	RNR 1.5 BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
398	А							Х				CS N & W FACES			
398	В							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS E & SE FACES		
ADDITIC PILE 398- CONDIT	B NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	CS	S N & V	V FACES										

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam Lo	Locat eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0948  Tide: +1.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Index + 1.0  Pile Type (bearing, batter, sheet).    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Vater III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  V  NI  ND  MJ  SV    398  C  V  V  X  VC 1/8"X2' W/CS E FACE 1' BLW PC (INTO MB)														
398	С								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS E FAC	E 1' BLW PC (INTO MB)		
												VC HL X 2' E FACE 1' BI	LW PC (INTO MB)		
399	С								Х			CS N FACE (SZ)			
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SE, E & S FACES		
												VC 1/8"X2.5' W/CS S FA	CE 0.5' BLW PC		
399	В								Х			CS W FACE (SZ, TYPIC	AL)		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X4' W/CS SE CR	NR AT TOP (INTO MB)		
399	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	//CS N FACE AT TOP		
												CS E, N (SZ, TYP) & W I	FACES		
400	А								Х			VC 1/2"X2' W/CS NE CR	RNR 0.5' BLW PC (INTO MB)		
ADDITIC PILE 400-	A NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED	CS	N & V	V FACES. VC	C HL X1.5	' W/CS E	E FACE	1' BLW PC	(INTO MG	)				
CONDIT	ION RATI	NG LEGEN	D: le												

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure:	Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 0948  Tide: +1.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber															
	Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Time of Day: 0948  Tide: +1.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Comments														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
400	A-BATT								Х			10% SL 15' BLW PC DUI	Е ТО МВ		
400	В								Х			VC 1/8"X1' W/CS N FAC	E 1.5' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X0.5' W/CS W FA	ACE 2' BLW PC		
400	С	Х			6'				Х			VC 1/4"X1.5' W/CS E FA	CE 0.5' BLW PC		
												CS E & W FACES			
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP (INTO MB)		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS S FA	CE 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X0.5' W/CS S F	ACE 2' BLW PC		
401	С								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X1' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
ADDITIO	NAL CON	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	C:	S E FA	CE										

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	f Day: 09	948		Tide:	+1.6'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Vater Depth      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating Depth      Concrete, Timber        Bent      Pile      Vater      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV      Concrete, Timber														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Water  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  III Insp  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
401	В							Х				CS W,S,E & N FACE (SZ	, TYP)		
401	А								Х			CS N FACE			
												VC HL X 1.5' E FACE AT	ТОР		
402	А									Х		OPEN SPALL 2" DIA X 3	/4" DEEP W/CS N FACE 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS W FAC	E 2' BLW PC (INTO MB)		
402	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1' W/CS N FA0	CE 2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS W FAC	E 2' BLW PC		
												CS W & S FACES			
402	С								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/EFF SE CF	RNR AT TOP (INTO MB)		
												CS W & N FACES			
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS W FA	CE 0.5 BLW PC		
ADDITIC PILE 402- CONDIT	ONAL CO	MMENTS: CONTINUED: NG LEGENI	: E) D:	XIST SI	HOTCRETE	REPAIR V	W/CS NV	V TO W	FACE						

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 0948  Tide: +1.6'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing Batter  Concrete Timber													
	Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV													
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
403	С								Х			CS N FACE		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REF	PAIR SW CRNR	
												VC 1/8"X1' W FACE 0.5 E	BLW PC (AT SHOTCRETE)	
403	C-BATT								Х			10% SL MB		
403	В								Х			CS N FACE		
												VC 1/8"X5' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REP	PAIR W/CS NW CRNR	
403	А									Х		CS NW (SZ, TYP), E & S	FACES	
												OPEN SPALL 1 SF X 1" I	DEEP SW CRNR 3' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X3' SE CRNR AT	ТОР	
	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>»:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 1050  Tide: +2.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Concrete  Timber															
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    404  A  X  5'  X  CSS FACE														
404	Location  Leven  Valer  Prile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Ni  Ni  Ni  Mi  Mi  Mi  SV    404  A  X  5'  X  CSS FACE														
404	A-BATT										Х	90% SL AT MB			
404	В								Х			VC 1/8"X2' S FACE AT T	OP		
												CS S FACE			
												VC 1/16"0.5' W/CS E FA	CE 0.5 BLW PC		
404	С									Х		OPEN SPALL 3" DIA X 0	.5" DEEP N FACE 2' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X8" W/CS W FA	CE 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/4"X2' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP (INTO MB)		
												VC 1/8"X3.5' W/CS S FA	CE AT TOP (INTO MB)		
												VC 1/4"X2' W/CS S FAC	E 0.5' BLW PC		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SE & S FACES		
ADDITIC	ONAL COL	MENTS: CONTINUED:	CS	SEFA	CE										
CONDIT	ION RATI	NG LEGENI	D:												
NI = Not	inspected	, inaccessib	le												

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	e: Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>.ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	Time of Day: 1050  Tide: +2.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location    Level II Insp    Level II III Insp    Water Depth    Pile    Water NI    NI    ND    MD    MJ    SV    Concrete, Timber														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second Sec														
405	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR W/CS E & SE FACES		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS S FACE	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS S FA	CE 1' BLW PC		
												CS S & E FACES			
												VC 1/4"X2' W FACE AT 1	TOP		
405	В							Х				CS N & W FACES (SZ, T	YP)		
405	А							Х				CS S & W FACES			
406	C-BATT										Х	50-60% SECTION LOSS	AT MUDLINE		
406	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E, S & W FACES		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS			
												VC 1/4"X3' W FACE			
	DNAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C berts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1050  Tide: +2.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Loca	Time of Day: 1050  Tide: +2.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Sheet													
Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    406  B  V  V  X  V  V														
406	В						Х							
406	А								Х			VC 1/4"X2.5' W FACE 1'	BLW PC	
407	А						Х							
407	В	Х			6'		Х							
407	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS W FACE	
												VC 1/8"X3.5' W/CS SW 0	CRNR AT TOP	
408	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SE, E & S FACES AT TOP	
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CS S FAC	E 0.5' BLW PC	
												VC 1/4"X3 W/CS SW CR	NR 0.5' BLW PC	
												VC 1/6"X2.5' W/CS E FA	CE 1' BLW PC	
408	В						Х							
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspect	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1050  Tide: +2.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing  Batter  Concrete  Timber													
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Index +2.8  Prile Type (Bearing, Batter)  Prile Material.    Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Prile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Prile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV														
408	А						Х							
409	А						Х							
409	В						Х							
409	С								Х			VC 1/2"X2.5' W/CS W FA	CE 0.5' BLW PC	
410	С								Х			VC HL X 3' W/CS W FAC	E 3' BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS N FAC	CE	
410	В								Х			VC HLX1' W/CS 2.5 BLW	/ PC	
												VC 1/16"X2' W/CS W FA	CE 2.5 BLW PC	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS W FAC	E 2.5' BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS S FAC	CE 2.5' BLW PC	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Be	erkel unici <sup>Ir</sup>	ey ipal Pier nspection To	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day	/: 10	50		Tide:	+2.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
-	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber														
Location	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MI  SV														
Bent Pi	Location  Level II Insp  Level III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second														
410 A	4	Х			6'					Х		VC 1/8"X2.5' W/CS E FA	CE 1.5' BLW PC		
												VC 1/6"X2' W/CS N FAC	E 1.5 BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X1' W FACE 2.5'	BLW PC		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR E & N FACES		
												OPEN SPALL 3" X 1' X 0	.15" NE CRNR 5' BLW PC		
												OPEN SPALL 0.5' DIA X	1/2" DEEP NW CRNR 9' BLW PC		
411 A	4								Х			VC HL X 1' E FACE 3' BL	-W PC		
411 E	3						Х								
411 (	C									Х		VC 1/16"X1' W/CS NW C	RNR 3' BLW PC		
												CLOSED SPALL 5' SF W	//CS SW CRNR 3" BLW PC		
												OPEN SPALL <1/4 SF x	1/2" DEEP W FACE 3' BLW PC		
ADDITIONAL PILE 411-C NC	DTE COM	IMENTS: ONTINUED:	Cl D:	OSED	SPALL SE (	CRNR AT	ТОР								

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1050  Tide: +2.8'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber    Comments  Comments  Comments													
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Value III Insp  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Comments    Bent  Pile  Value  NI  ND  MJ  SV													
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  Image: Second													
412	С								Х			VC 1/8"X3' S FACE AT T	OP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' S FACE 3' E	BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X2' W FACE 2.5	BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS W F	ACE 3' BLW PC	
412	В								Х			VC 1/16"X2' E FACE 2.5'	BLE PC	
												CS E FACE		
												VC HL X 1.5' W/CS SW (	CRNR 2.5 BLW PC	
												CS SE CRNR		
412	А								Х			VC 1/16"X3' W/CS E FAC	CE AT TOP	
												CS E FACE		
413	А									Х		OPEN SPALL 1 SF X 1.5	" DEEP NE CRNR AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 1318  Tide: +5.0'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber															
	Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location      Level II Insp      Level Water Depth      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating Depth      Concrete, Timber        Bent      Pile      III Insp      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV														
Bent	Location  Level II  Level Nevel  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  III  Insp  III  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV    413  R  X  Image: State														
413	В	Х			5'				Х			VC 1/8"X2' W FACE 2' BI	LW PC		
413	С								Х			VC 1/8"X4' S FACE AT T	OP		
												VC 1/16"X1' NE CRNR 3'	BLW PC		
414	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SE CRNR AT TOP W/		
												CLOSED SPALL 4 SF W	/CS SW CRNR		
414	В						Х								
414	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF W	/CS SE CRNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X2' E FACE AT	ТОР		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR NW CRNR		
												CLOSED SPALL 4 SF N	W CRNR AT TOP		
415	А								Х			VC HL X 2.5' W/EFF W F	ACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munio	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam L	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1336  Tide: +5.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Rearing, Ratter  Concrete  Timber														
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Vater Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Concrete, Timber    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV													
Location  Level II  Level Mater  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MN  MD  MJ  SV    415  B  NI  X  V  V  V														
415	В						Х							
415	С									Х		VC 1/8"X3' W/EFF W FA	CE AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SE CRNR	
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5' BL	N PC	
												VC 1/8"X4' E FACE AT T	OP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5 W/CS S FA	CE 1' BLW PC	
416	С								Х			VC 1/16"X1.5' S FACE 1	5 BLW PC	
416	В						Х							
416	А	Х			5'					Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS NE & E FACE AT TOP	
												VC HL X 1' W/CS NE CR	NR 5' BLW PC	
												OPEN SPALL 0.5' DIA X	3/4" DEEP NE CRNR 10' BLW PC	
	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	e: Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	œam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time of Day: 1336  Tide: +5.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter  Pile Material: Concrete, Timber    Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments															
Loca	Location  Level II Insp  Level Vater Depth  Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating Depth  Comments    Bent  Pile														
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  V  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV    416  A PATT  V  V  V  V  V  V														
416	A-BATT										Х	30% SL. DISCONNECTE	D AT TOP. HOLLOW 4' BTM		
417	А						Х								
417	В								Х			VC 1/16"X2' W FACE 2.5	BLW PC		
417	С									Х		VC HL X 2.5' W/EFF E F/	ACE AT TOP		
												CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	/CS SW CRNR IN SHOTCRETE		
418	C-BATT										Х	25% SL AT ML DUE TO	MB. DISCONNECTED FROM TOP		
418	С								Х			VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E 1' BLW PC		
418	В								Х			VC 1/8"X1' SW CRNR 2.	5 BLW PC		
												VC 1/4"X1' W FACE 2' BI	LW PC		
418	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS & CRACKS S FACE		
419	А								Х			VC 3/16"X2.5' W/CS N F	ACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC PILE 419	A NOTE C	MMENTS: ONTINUED	: E>	KIST SH	HOTCRETE I	REPAIR V	V FACE								

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1336  Tide: +5.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing, Batter  Concrete, Timber													
	Location  Level II  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments													
Loca	Location    Level II Insp    Level Vater III Insp    Water Depth    Pile    Vater Depth    Pile    Vater Depth    NI    ND    MD    MJ    SV    Concrete, Timber													
Location  Level II  Level Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  ND  MD  MJ  SV														
419	В						Х							
419	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR E,SE,S & SW FACES	
												CLOSED SPALL 3 SF IN	SHOTCRETE	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' W FACE 1'	BLW PC	
												VC 1/4"X2.5' NW CRNR	AT TOP	
420	С	Х			6'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR S, SW & W FACES	
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC HL X 3' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
420	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1' N FACE 2.5	BLW PC	
												VC 1/16"X2' W/CS S FAC	CE 2.5 BLW PC	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	e: Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 10, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time c	Time of Day: 1336  Tide: +5.1'  Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):  Pile Material:    Bearing  Batter  Concrete  Timber														
	Location  Level  Water  Pile Condition Rating  Comments														
Location      Level II Insp      Level Value III Insp      Water Depth      Pile Condition Rating Depth      Comments        Bent      Pile      Value      NI      ND      MD      MJ      SV															
Bent	Location  Level II Insp  Level Water Depth  Pile Condition Rating  Comments    Bent  Pile  NI  NI  MN  MD  MJ  SV    420  A  V  X  EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR SW CRNR OVEROPEN SPALL														
420	А							Х				EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SW CRNR OVEROPEN SPALL		
420	A-BATT									Х		30% SL 1' ABOVE MUDL	INE		
421	А						Х								
421	В								Х			VC HL X 0.5' W FACE 1.5	5' BLW PC		
												VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS W F	ACE 2.5 BLW PC		
421	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE REI	PAIR SW CRNR W/		
												CLOSED SPALL & 1" WI	DE CRACKING ON BOTH SIDES OF		
												SHOTCRETE. VC 1/8"X	3' W/CS W FACE 0.5' BLW PC		
	DNAL CO	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage
Structur	e: Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Ei Augus	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time	of Day: 08	320		Tide:	+0.3'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	l, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loc	Location     Level II Insp     Level Vater Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating Depth     Concrete, Timber       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV														
Bent	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV														
422	Α									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, E & S FACE		
												CS N, SW & S FACE			
												CLOSED SPALL NE CRI	NR W/ VC 1/8"X3'		
422	В								Х			CORROSION STAIN (CS	S) N FACE		
												VERTICAL CRACK (VC)	1/4"X1' E FACE AT TOP		
422	С									Х		CS S & W FACE			
												CLOSED SPALL W/SHO	TCRETE 1.5 SF W/CS NE CRNR		
422	C-BATT						Х								
423	С								Х			CS E FACE			
												VC 1/4"X1' SW CRNR A	ГТОР		
												VC 1/4"X3 W/CS S FACE	E AT TOP		
ADDITIC PILE 423	-C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: V(	C 1/4"X	2' W/CS W F	ACE AT	TOP. VC	1/12"X	1' W FACE (	3' BLW PC					

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structur	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time	of Day: 08	20		Tide:	+0.3'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loc	Time of Day: 0820     Tide: +0.3'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material: Concrete, Timber       Location     Level II Insp     Level Water III Insp     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV       423     B     X     5'     X     CS W FACE     Concrete, Supervision														
Bent	Location     Level II Insp     Level III Insp     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     Image: Stress of the stress														
423	В	Х			5'			Х				CS W FACE			
423	А								Х			VC 1/8"X2' W/CS N FAC	E 0.5' BLW CAP		
												VC 1/16"X0.5' W/CS N F.	ACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/2"X2' W/CS NW CF	RNR 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
424	А							Х				CS N FACE			
424	A-BATT										Х	90% SECTION LOSS (SI	L) 1.5' BLW PC.		
												DISCONNECTED FROM	ТОР		
424	В							Х				CS W & E FACES			
424	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SW CRNR		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
ADDITI PILE 424	-C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	:V	C 1/8"X	3' W/CS S F.	ACE AT T	OP. VC	1/16"X1	' S FACE 2'	BLW PC.	CS S FA	NCE.			

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Ber Mui	keley hicipal Pier Inspection T	- eam	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton			
Time of Day:	Time of Day: 0820     Tide: +0.3'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing, Batter     Concrete, Timber														
-	Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Location	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating Depth     Concrete, Timber       Bent     Pile     Image: Additional content of the second co														
Bent Pile	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV       425     C     VC 1/16" X 3' S FACE AT TOP (INTO MG)														
425 C								Х			VC 1/16" X 3' S FACE AT	TOP (INTO MG)			
425 B						Х									
425 A							Х				CS W & N FACES				
426 A								Х			CS N, NE & S FACES				
											VC 1/4"X1.5' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP			
											VC 1/4"X1.5' W/CS SW 0	CRNR AT TOP			
426 B						Х									
426 C	Х			6'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS SW CRNR			
											VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP			
											VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FACI	E AT TOP			
											VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS S FA	CE AT TOP			
ADDITIONAL O	OMMENTS: E CONTINUED	: C	S N FA	CE.											

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017 k	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day:     0820     Tide:     +0.3'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Loca	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Insp     III Insp     Depth     III Insp     III Insp     III Insp														
Bent	Location     Level II Insp     Level Depth     Water Depth       Bent     Pile     III Insp     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV       427     C     III     III     III     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV														
427	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REP	PAIR S & W FACES		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FACE	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
427	В									Х		CLOSED SPALL 1 SF E	FACE		
427	А							Х				1' TALL TIMBER PILE ST	UB HARD AGAINS NE CRNR		
												CS N FACE			
428	A-BATT										Х	DISCONNECTED FROM	PC		
428	А							Х				CS W & N FACE			
428	В	Х			6'			Х				CS W FACE			
428	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE REP	PAIR SW CRNR		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS & EFF	S FACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC PILE 428-	ONAL CON C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	C	S W FA	CE										

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0820     Tide: +0.3'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing     Batter     Concrete     Timber														
	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Loca	Image: Searing, BatterConcrete, TimberLocationLevel II InspLevel III InspWater DepthPile Condition Rating MNCommentsBentPileVVNINDMNMDMJSV														
Bent	Location     Level II Insp     Level Vater Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     III Insp     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV       429     C     III     III     III     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV														
429	С								Х			VC 1/8"X1' W/EFF S FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP		
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NE, SW CRNR		
												VC 1/2"X1' W/CS W FAC	E 1' BLW PC		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP		
												CS N FACE			
429	В									Х		FAILING SHOTCRETE S	W CRNR		
												CLOSED SPALL ON PIL	E		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S & W	FACES AT TOP (EDGES OF SPALL)		
												CS NW CRNR			
429	А			Х				Х				CS S & E FACE			
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	: Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam L	Locat eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0820     Tide: +0.3'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter     Pile Material: Concrete, Timber       Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating Depth     Concrete, Timber       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV														
Bent	Bearing, Batter       Concrete, Timber         Location       Level II Insp       Level Depth       Water Depth       Pile Condition Rating       Comments         Bent       Pile														
430	А								Х			VC 1/16"X1' N FACE AT	ТОР		
												CS N FACE			
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SW CRNR		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X2' W/CS SW CF	RNR IN SHOTCRETE		
												VC 1/8"X0.5' W/CS SE 0	.5 BLW PC		
430	В									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NE CRNR		
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS E FA	CE 1' BLW PC		
												CS E, NE & W FACES			
430	С								Х			VC 1/8"X1' W/EFF & CS	W FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP (INTO MG)		
ADDITIC PILE 430- CONDIT	NAL COI C: CS S ON RATI	MMENTS: SW CRNR NG LEGENI	D:												

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley ipal Pier	- eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 0950     Tide: +1.0'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing, Batter     Concrete, Timber														
	Bearing, Batter     Concrete, Timber       Location     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level III Insp     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating Depth     Comments       Bent     Pile     V     V     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV														
Bent	Location       Level II Insp       Level III Insp       Water Depth       Pile Condition Rating       Comments         Bent       Pile       Image: Second														
431	С	Х			5'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, E, S & W FACES		
												VC 1/16"X1' W/EFF S FA	CE AT TOP		
												HORIZONTAL CRACK (H	HC) 1/8"X1' E FACE IN SHOTCRETE		
												CS N & W FACES			
												VC HL X 1' W/EFF W FA	CE 0.5' BLW PC		
431	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR		
												VCs W/CS & EFF W FAC	E IN SHOTCRETE		
												CS S FACE			
431	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP		
												VC 1/16"X1' W/EFF SW (	CRNR AT TOP IN SHOTCRETE		
												VC 1/16"X1' W/EFF NW	CRNR AT TOP IN SHOTCRETE		
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structur	e: Berke Munic	ley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time	of Day: <b>()</b> 9	50		Tide:	+1.0'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
		-			-				Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loc	Location     Level II     Level     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MI     SV													
Bent	Bent     Pile     NI     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
432	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												HC W FACE IN INTERSE	ECTION BTW SHOTCRETE & TOP	
												CS N FACE		
432	A-BATT										Х	DISCONNECTED FROM	TOP. ND IN WATER	
432	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X0.5' W/EFF W F	ACE AT TOP	
432	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												HC 1/8" W/EFF S & E FA	CES AT TOP	
433	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/EFF S F/	ACE AT TOP	
												HC HL X 2' W/EFF E FAG	CE IN SHOTCRETE	
ADDITI PILE 433	-C NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: V(	C 1/8"X	0.5' W/EFF N	NW CRNR	R AT TOP	5						

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	XA PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 0950     Tide: +1.0'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing     Batter     Concrete     Timber													
	Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber													
Loca	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MJ     SV													
Location     Level II Insp     Level III Insp     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     NI     MN     MD     MJ     SV       433     B     S     S     X     EXIST SHOTCRETE REPAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP														
433	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												CS W FACE BLW SHOT	CRETE & INTO SHOTCRETE (SC)	
												EFF W FACE AT BOTTC	DM (BTM)	
												VC 1/8"X1' E/EFF SW CF	RNR AT TOP	
												HC 1/8"X1.5' SE & E FAC	CES IN SHOTCRETE	
433	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												HC 1/8"X1' E FACE INTE	RSECTION BTW PILE & CAP	
												CS W FACE BLW SHOT	CRTE	
434	А								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR N, S, E & W FACES AT TOP	
												CS W & N FACES BLW S	SHOTCRETE	
												HC 1/8"X0.5' W/EFF E F/	ACE INTERSECTION BTW PILE & CAP	
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic ۱	ley Sipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017 b	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	of Day: 10	25		Tide:	+1.4'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:		
									Bearing	j, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber		
Loca	Location       Level II Insp       Level N       Water Depth       Pile       Water III Insp       Pile       Water NI       NI       ND       MD       MJ       SV       Concrete, Timber         Bent       Pile														
Bent	Location     Level II Insp     Level Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     Image: Second Se														
434	В	Х			5'				Х			CS N & W FACES BLW S	SHOTCRETE		
												EXIST SC REPAIR N,S,E	& W FACES BTW PILE & CAP		
												HC 1/8"X1.5' S FACE BT	W PILE & CAP		
												VC 1/16"0.5' W/EFF NE 0	CRNR AT TOP		
434	С								Х			EXIST SC REPAIR N,S,E	& W FACES BTW PILE & CAP		
												CS W FACE BLW SHOT	CRETE		
												VC HL X 1' W FACE AT 1	ГОР		
												HC 1/8"X1.5' W/EFF W F	ACE BTW PILE & CAP		
434	C-BATT										Х	DISCONNECTED FROM	TOP. BROKEN 6'-7' ABOVE ML		
435	С								Х			EXIST SC REPAIR N,S,E	& W FACES BTW PILE & CAP		
												VC HL X 3' W/EFF & CS	S FACE AT TOP		
ADDITIC PILE 435	ONAL COM C: VC1/	MMENTS: 8"X1.5' W/EF	FEF	FACE A	T TOP. CS I	N FACE II	N SHOT	CRETE.	CS W FAC	E BLW SH	IOTCRE	TE.			

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	ley ipal Pier nspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: [ / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	Time of Day: 1025     Tide: +1.4'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing, Batter     Pile Material: Concrete, Timber       Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments													
Loca	Location         Level II Insp         Level Vater Depth         Water Depth         Pile         Water Depth         Pile         Mater Depth         Ma													
Bent	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV       435     B     NI     NI     NI     NI     NI     EXIST SC REPAIR N S E & W EACES BTW PILE & CAP													
435	В								Х			EXIST SC REPAIR N,S,E	E & W FACES BTW PILE & CAP	
												CS W FACE BLW SHOT	CRETE	
												HC 1/8"X1.5' W/EFF E F/	ACE BTW PILE & CAP	
435	А								Х			EXIST SC REPAIR N,S,E	E & W FACES BTW PILE & CAP	
												CS S FACE BLW SHOTO	CRETE	
												VC HL X 0.5' N FACE AT	ТОР	
												HC 1/8"X4' W FACE INTI	ERSECTION BTW PILE & CAP	
436	А								Х			VC HL X 1' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS NW C	RNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS S FA	CE AT TOP	
436	A-BATT										Х	10% SL FROM MB. DISC	CONNECTED FROM TOP	
ADDITIC	DNAL CO	<u>MENTS:</u>												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	- Team I	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	DA PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton		
Time o	Time of Day: 1025     Tide: +1.4'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing     Batter     Concrete     Timber														
	Location     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Concrete, Timber														
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level Vater III Insp     Water Depth     Pile     Vater Depth     Pile     Concrete, Timber       Bent     Pile     Vater     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV														
Location     Level II Insp     Level III Insp     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     Image: Comments     Image: Comments     Image: Comments       436     B     Image: Comments     Image: Comments     Image: Comments															
436	В								Х			CS E & W FACES AT TO	)P		
												VC 1/8"X3' S FACE AT T	OP (INTO MG)		
436	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF S	W CRNR BLW EXIST SC REPAIR		
												VC 1/2"X3' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP EDGE OF CLOSED SPALL		
												VC 1/8"X3' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP EDGE OF CLOSED SPALL		
												CS W & S FACES BLW	SPALL		
437	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SE CRNR OVER CLOSED SPALL		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S FAC	E AT TOP EDGE OF CLOSED SPALL		
												VC 1/8"X3' S FACE AT T	OP (INTO MG)		
												VC 1/16"X1.5' W/CS S F.	ACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/2"X3' W/CS E FAC	E AT TOP EDGE OF CLOSED SPALL		
ADDITIC PILE 437	ONAL CO C NOTE (	MMENTS: CONTINUED	: VC	C 1/2"X	2' W/CS W F	ACE AT 1	ΓΟΡ								
CONDIT NI = Not	ION RATI	NG LEGEN	D: le												

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure:	Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection To	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C berts,	A PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of [	Day: 10	)25		Tide:	+1.5'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Locati	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating Depth     Concrete, Timber       Bent     Pile     Value     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
Bent	Location     Level II Insp     Level Mater Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
437	В								Х			CS W FACE		
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/4"X1' N FACE 2' BL	_W PC (INTO MG)	
437	А	Х			6'				Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS NE CRNR	
												VC HL X 1' E FACE 1' BI	LW PC	
												CS E & N FACES BLW S	SHOTCRETE	
438	А							Х				CS S & N FACES		
438	В								Х			CS W FACE		
												VC 1/8"X2' S W/CS S FA	CE 1' BLW PC (INTO MG)	
438	С								Х			VC 1/4"X3' N FACE AT 1	TOP (INTO MG)	
												VC 1/8"X2' S FACE AT T	OP	
ADDITION PILE 438-C	NOTE C	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	: CS	S E FA	CE									

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier nspection T	eam l	Locat _eader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1025     Tide: +1.5'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing Batter     Concrete, Timber														
	Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments													
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level III Insp     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     Image: State of the state													
Bent	Level Insp     Level Insp     Valer Depth       Bent     Pile     Image: Second transmission of the condition realing													
438	A-BATT										Х	BROKEN 7' BLW CAP		
439	С								Х			VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS SE C	RNR 0.25' BLW PC	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/CS W, SW & S FACES	
												VC 1/16"X1' W/CS S FAC	CE 0.25 BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FAC	E 1' BLW PC (INTO MG)	
439	В								Х			OPEN SPALL 3" DIA X 1	/2" DEEP SW CRNR AT TOP	
439	А								Х			VC HL X 1.5' S FACE AT	ТОР	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NW & W FACES	
												CS W FACE IN SC & BL	W SC ON PILE	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS N FA	CE AT TOP	
440	А								Х			OPEN SPALL 2" DIA X 1	/2" DEEP NE CRNR	
ADDITIC PILE 440-	A NOTE C	MMENTS: ONTINUED:	OF	PEN SF	PALL 7" DIA 2	X 1/2" DEI	EP N FA	CE. CS	N FACE.					

CONDITION RATING LEGEND: NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: <b>1(</b>	)25		Tide:	+1.4'				Pile Type	(Bearing, I	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Battei	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location     Level II     Level Water       Insp     III Insp     Depth													
Bent	Bent     Pile     Image: Control of the second seco													
440	В							Х				CS E & S FACES		
440	С								Х			VC 1/4"X1' W/CS & EFF	N FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS SW CF	RNR AT TOP	
												EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	APIR S & E FACES	
												VC 1/8"X1' W/CS S FAC	E 1' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X2' S FACE AT T	OP (GOES INTO CAP)	
												VC W/EFF E FACE IN &	OUT OF SHOTCRETE	
441	А									Х		VC 1/2"X2.5 NW CRNR /	AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF N	W CRNR AT TOP	
441	В						Х							
441	С								Х			EXIST SC REPAIR W/VC	C 1/8"X2' S FACE AT TOP	
ADDITIC PILE 441-	ONAL COL	MMENTS: CONTNUED:	OP	EN SP/	ALL <1 SF X	1/2" DEE	P 2.5' Bl	LW PC.	VC 1/16"X1	' W/CS S F	ACE 3' I	BLW PC		
CONDIT NI = Not ND = No	ION RATI inspected Deteriora	NG LEGENI , inaccessib tion/Damage	D: le											

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	ley Sipal Pier	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1234     Tide: +3.8'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Rearing     Restor     Concrete     Timber														
	Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments													
Loca	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MJ     SV													
Bent	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Insp     III Insp     Depth     Ni     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
442	C-BATT										Х	10% SL AT MUDLINE FF	ROM MARINE BORER ACTIVITY	
												CONNECTION HARDWA	ARE AT TOP IS SEVERE	
442	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/ SPIDER CRACK W/CS	
												SW TO S FACE		
442	В	Х			6'				Х			VC 1/16"X1' SW CRNR 2	2.5' BLW PC	
442	А						Х							
443	А								Х			VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS W FA	CE 2.5' BLW PC	
443	В									Х		OPEN SPALL 6" DIA X 1	" DEEP W/CS SW CRNR 3' BLW PC	
												VC 1/8"X1.5' W/CS COM	ING FROM SPALL	
												VC 1/16"X3' W/CS COMI	NG FROM SPALL	
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 1234     Tide: +3.8'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):     Pile Material:       Bearing, Batter     Concrete Timber														
	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments													
Loca	Location     Level II     Level Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MJ     SV													
Bent	Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
443	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/ X2 CRACK 1/2" SW TO S FACE	
												OPEN SPALL 1 SFX1.5"	DEEP E FACE	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' SE CRNR A	AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS S FACE	
												VC 1/2"X2' W/CS EXTEN	IDING DOWN FROM SPALL	
												VC 1/8"X2.5' SW CRNR	0.5' BLW PC	
444	С							Х				CS S FACE AT TOP		
444	В								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR NE & N FACE	
												VC 1/16"X1' N FACE 1.5	BLW PC	
444	А									Х		VC 1/16"X3' W/EFF W F/	ACE AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	NW CRNR AT TOP	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke Munic ו	ley Sipal Pier nspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>iion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 13	02		Tide:	+4.3'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV													
Bent	Bent     Pile     Ni     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
444	A-BATT										Х	50% SL DOWN TO ML. I	DISCONNECTED AT TOP	
445	А						Х							
445	В						Х							
445	С	Х			6'					Х		VC 1/4"X2.5' W/CS W FA	CE AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/ASSOCIATED CRACKS UP TO 1" W	
												S FACE		
												OPEN SPALL 4 SF X 1.5	" DEEP WITH HEAVY CS IN SPALL	
												S FACE 5' BLW PC		
446	C-BATT										Х	40% SL 4' UP MUDLINE	(ML). PILE DISCONNECTED AT TOP	
446	С									Х		EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR W/ CLOSED SPALL SW CRNR.	
												VC 1/2"X2' W/CS SW CR	NR 1.5' BLW PC	
ADDITIC PILE 446-	ONAL CON	MENTS: ONTINUED	: V(	C 1/8"X	3' W/CS SE	CRNR AT	TOP (IN	NTO MG	;)					

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	PE	Inspec	Company: ction Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 11. 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
										Jugue	, _			
Time o	f Day: 13	302		Tide:	+4.3'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location     Level II     Insp     Water Depth       Bent     Pile     Ville     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV														
446	В									Х		VC 1/4"X2.5' NE CRNR A	AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF E	FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS N FAC	E AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2.5 N FACE 2' E	BLW PC (INTO MG)	
446	А									Х		VC 1/8"X2' W/CS E FACI	E 2.5 BLW PC	
												CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	ASSOCIATED CRACK UP TO 1/2" W	
												W/CS AT TOP		
447	А								Х			VC 1/16"X2' W/CS N FAG	CE AT TOP	
447	В						Х							
447	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL W/CRA	CK 1/16" 1.5 SF S FACE 0.5' BLW PC	
448	С								Х			EXIST SHOTCRETE RE	PAIR SW & S FACES	
ADDITIC PILE 448-	ONAL CO	MMENTS: CONTINUED:	:V	C 1/4"X	3' W/CS S F/	ACE AT T	OP (EXT	FENDS	INTO MG). Y	VC 1/16"X	(0.5' W F.	ACE 2' BLW PC		
CONDIT	ION RATI	NG LEGENI	D:											

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>::</sup> Berke Munic	ley ipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton
Time c	f Day: 13	54		Tide:	+5.0'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S r	Sheet):	Pile Material:
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating Depth     Concrete, Timber       Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV												
Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV													
448	В								Х			VC 1/16"X1' W/CS N FAC	CE 2' BLW PC (INTO MG)
												CS S FACE	
												VC 1/16"2' W FACE 2' BL	W PC
448	А								Х			VC 1/8"X4' W/CS E FAC	E 1' BLW PC
												VC HL X 0.5' W/CS NW (	CRNR
												VC HL X 2' W FACE 2' B	LW PC
448	A-BATT										Х	50% SL. DISCONNECTE	D AT TOP
449	А	Х			6'					Х		VC 1/4"X1.5' W/CS NW 0	CRNR AT TOP
												VC 1/16"X2' W/CS W FA	CE 1' BLW PC
												OPEN SPALL 1 SF X 3/4	" DEEP N FACE 5' BLW PC
449	В								Х			VC HL X 1' N FACE 1' BL	W PC (INTO MG)
ADDITIC	NAL CO	MMENTS:											

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Berke <sup>»</sup> Munic ۱	ley ipal Pier nspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Rc	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time c	f Day: 13	54		Tide:	+5.0'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     Value     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
Bent     Pile     NI     ND     MN     MD     MJ     SV														
449	С								Х			VC 1/8"X3' S FACE 1' BL	W PC (INTO MG)	
												VC 1/16"/0.5' N FACE 2.5	5' BLW PC (INTO MG)	
450	C-BATT										Х	40% SL AT BTM. DISCO	NNECTED AT TOP	
450	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF N	W CRNR AT TOP	
450	В						Х							
450	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS NW CRNR 1' BLW PC	
												W/ CS & CRACKS UP TO	D 1/2" W	
451	А						Х							
451	В						Х							
451	С								Х			3X VC 1/8"X2' W/CS S F.	ACE AT TOP (INTO MG)	
												VC 1/4"X2' W FACE 0.5'	BLW PC	
ADDITIC	DNAL COM	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>e:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam	Locat Leader	ion: Berk	eley, C berts,	A PE	Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus	nginee t 11, 2	ering, Inc. 017	Divers: F	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton
Time o	f Day: <b>1</b> 4	21		Tide:	+5.2'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):		Pile Material:
									Bearing					Concrete
Loca	Location     Level II Insp     Level Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     Image: Second Se													
Bent	Level insp     Level insp     Valer Depth       Bent     Pile     Image: Second s													
452	Bent         Pile         Image: Constraint of the state of the stat													
452	Bent         Pile         NI         ND         MN         MD         MJ         SV           452         C          X <td< td=""></td<>													
452	А						Х							
453	А	Х			6'		Х							
453	В						Х							
453	С						Х							
454	С						Х							
454	В						Х							
454	А						Х							
455	А						Х							
455	В						Х							
ADDITIC PILE 455-	ONAL COL C ND.	MMENTS:												
CONDIT	ION RATI	NG LEGEN	D:											
NI = Not	inspected	l, inaccessib	le											

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Eerke Munic	eley cipal Pier	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	A PE	( Inspec	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 14, 2	ering, Inc. 017	Divers: F / /	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton
Time of Day: 0815     Tide: +2.8'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing     Pile Material: Concrete       Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Loca	Location     Level II     Level     Water Depth       Bent     Pile     Image     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV													
Location     Level II Insp     Level Water Depth     Water Depth     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     V     V     NI     ND     MD     MJ     SV														
456	A						X	IVIII	ND	1010	01			
456	В	Х			8'		Х							
456	С						Х							
457	С						Х							
457	В						Х							
457	А						Х							
458	А						Х							
458	В						Х							
458	С						Х							
459	С						Х							
459	В						Х							
	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	<sup>:</sup> Berke Munic	eley cipal Pier Inspection T	eam l	Locat Leader	<sup>ion:</sup> Berk : Paul Ro	eley, C oberts,	CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 14, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time of Day: 0830     Tide: +2.7'     Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet): Bearing     Pile Material: Concrete       Location     Level II     Level     Water     Pile Condition Rating     Comments														
Loca	Location     Level II     Level     Water Depth       Bent     Pile     Vitic													
Location     Level if     Level if     Valer     Pile Condition Rating     Comments       Bent     Pile     NI     NI     MN     MD     MJ     SV														
459	A	Х			9		X							
460	А						Х							
460	В						Х							
460	С						Х							
461	С						Х							
461	В						Х							
461	А						Х							
462	А						Х							
462	В						Х							
462	С							Х				VOID 2" DIA X 1" DEEP	N FACE 2' BLW PC	
ADDITIC	NAL COI	MMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure	Structure: Berkeley Location: Berkeley, CA Municipal Pier Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE Ins							( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 14, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017 F	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton
Time of Day: 0855 Tide: +2.4'							Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):Pile Material:BearingConcrete						
Location Level II Insp I			Le III I	∍vel Insp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ing			Comments
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv		
463	С	Х			8.6'		Х			-			
463	В							Х				CS S FACE 1 BLW PC	
												VOID/OPEN SPALL 2.5"	DIA X 1/2" DEEP N FACE 1.5 BLW PC
463	А						Х						
464	А						Х						
464	В							Х				CS 0.5 SF S FACE AT TO	OP
464	С							Х				CS 2" DIA S FACE 1' BL	N PC
465	С							Х				OPEN SPALL 2.5" DIA X	0.5" DEEP N FACE 1' BLW PC
465	В					X						OPEN SPALL 2.5" DIA X	0.5" DEEP N FACE 3' BLW PC
465	А						Х						
466 A X													
ADDITIC	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Berkeley Location: Berkeley, CA Municipal Pier Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE Ins								C	Company:	Sea Er August	nginee : 14, 2	ring, Inc. 017	Divers: F / k	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton
Time of	Time of Day: 0912 Tide: +2.2'				Pile Type (Bearing, Batter, Sheet):					Pile Material:				
						Bearing Concrete				Concrete				
Loca	Location Level II Level Water Pile Cor Insp III Insp Depth			le Con	dition Rat	ing				Comments				
Bent	Pile					NI ND MN			MD	MJ	sv			
466	В	Х			9'		Х							
466	С						Х							
467	С						Х							
467	В						Х							
467	А						Х							
ADDITIO	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Berkeley Location: Berkeley, CA Municipal Pier Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE Ins							DA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee t 14, 2	ering, Inc. Divers:   / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1020 Tide: +1.9'							Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Pile Material:			
									Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber	
Location Level II Insp		Le III I	evel Insp	Water Depth		Pi	le Con	dition Rat	ing	_		Comments		
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	SV			
282	С	Х			1'					Х		CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	W/CS S FACE AT TOP	
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS SW CRNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/4"X4.5' W FACE A	ГТОР	
												CLOSED SPALL 0.5 SF	W FACE AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 0.5 SF	E FACE AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 1 SF N	E CRNR AT TOP	
283	С									Х		VC HL X 2' W/CS W FAC	E AT TOP	
												OPEN SPALL 1 SF X 1.5	" DEEP SW CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X2.5' SW CRNF	R AT TOP	
283	В									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W/CS SE CRNR AT TOP		
												CLOSED SPALL 1.5 SF	SW CRNR AT TOP	
ADDITIC PILE 283- CONDIT	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: PILE 283-B NOTE CONTINUED: VC 1/16"X3.5' S FACE AT TOP. VC 1/16"X3' W/CS W FACE AT TOP. CONDITION RATING LEGEND:													

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Berkeley Location: Berkeley, CA Municipal Pier Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE Inspection								( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Augus <sup>:</sup>	nginee t 14, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	f Day: 10	20		Tide:	+1.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Sheet):	Pile Material:	
							Bearing	, Batte	r		Concrete, Timber			
Location Level II Level Water Pile Co Insp III Insp Depth				le Con	dition Rat	ing			Comments					
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv			
283	А									Х		VC 1/8"X2' W/CS N FACE AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS NE CRNR AT TOP		
												VC 1/8"X2' W/CS W FACE AT TOP		
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS & EF	F S FACE AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 2.5 SF	E FACE AT TOP	
284	А									Х		CLOSED SPALL 2 SF W	/CS NW CRNR AT TOP	
												CLOSED SPALL 4 SF W	/CS NE CRNR AT TOP	
284	В									Х		CLOSED SPALL 0.5 SF	W/CS SE CRNR AT TOP	
												VC HL X 2.5' W/CS NW CRNR AT TOP		
												OPEN SPALL 1.5 SF X 1.5" DEEP N FACE 5' BLW PC		
ADDITIO	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Berkeley Location: Berkeley, CA Municipal Pier Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE Ins								( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er August	nginee : 14, 2	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton	
Time o	Time of Day: 1020 Tide: +1.8'					Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Pile Material:					
							Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timbe				Concrete, Timber			
Loca	Location Level II Level Water Pile Co Insp III Insp Depth				le Con	dition Rat	ing			Comments				
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	sv			
284	С									Х		CLOSED SPALL 3 SF W	/CS SW CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X2.5' W/CS & El	FF SE CRNR AT TOP	
												VC 1/16"X2' W/CS NW CRNR AT TOP		
285	С									Х		VC 1/4"X3' SW CRNR A1	ТОР	
												OPEN (15%) CLOSED (8	5%) SPALL 2 SF X 1" DEEP	
												S FACE 2' BLW PC		
285	В						Х							
285	А							Х				CS 1 SF W FACE AT TO	P	
ADDITIC	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:													

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

Structure: Berkeley Location: Berkeley, CA Municipal Pier Inspection Team Leader: Paul Roberts, PE Ins							CA PE	( Inspec	Company: tion Date:	Sea Er Septer	nginee nber 7	ering, Inc. Divers: F / 7, 2017	P. Roberts A. Gonzalez K. Walton
Time o	f Day: 1(	)42		Tide:	+3.8'				Pile Type	(Bearing,	Batter, S	Pile Material:	
						Bearing, Batter Concrete, Timber							
Loca	Location Level II Level Water Pile C Insp III Insp Depth			le Con	dition Rat	ing			Comments				
Bent	Pile					NI	ND	MN	MD	MJ	SV		
280	А						Х					2' EXPOSED ONLY S FA	ACE
280	В						Х					3' EXPOSED	
280	С					Х						NOT ACCESSIBLE. COV	/ERED IN CONC. OVERPOUR
281	А						Х					2.5' EXPOSED ONLY AC	CCESSIBLE S & W FACES
281	В								Х			4' EXPOSED	
												VC HL X 1' W FACE 2' B	LW PC
281	С						Х						
282	А						Х					5' EXPOSES ONLY ACC	ESSIBLE E FACE
282	В									Х		5'-6' EXPOSED. VC 1/4">	X4.5' E FACE AT TOP (INTO MG)
												VC 1/4"X6.5' W FACE AT	ГТОР
									CLOSED SPALL 2 SF N	FACE AT TOP			
	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:												

CONDITION RATING LEGEND:

NI = Not inspected, inaccessible

ND = No Deterioration/Damage

MN = Minor Deterioration/Damage

MD = Moderate Deterioration/Damage

MJ = Major Deterioration/Damage

# APPENDIX 4: REFERENCES

#### WATERFRONT FACILITIES INSPECTION AND ASSESSMENT

Ra	ting	Description
6	Good	No visible damage or only minor damage noted. Structural elements may show very minor deterioration, but no overstressing observed. No repairs are required.
5	Satisfactory	Limited minor to moderate defects or deterioration observed, but no overstressing observed. No repairs are required.
4	Fair	All primary structural elements are sound, but minor to moderate defects or deterioration observed. Localized areas of moderate to advanced deterioration may be present, but do not significantly reduce the load- bearing capacity of the structure. Repairs are recommended, but the priority of the recommended repairs is low
3	Poor	Advanced deterioration or overstressing observed on widespread portions of the structure, but does not significantly reduce the load-bearing capacity of the structure. Repairs may need to be carried out with moderate urgency.
2	Serious	Advanced deterioration, overstressing, or breakage may have significantly affected the load-bearing capacity of primary structural components. Local failures are possible, and loading restrictions may be necessary. Repairs may need to be carried out on a high-priority basis with urgency.
1	Critical	Very advanced deterioration, overstressing, or breakage has resulted in localized failure(s) of primary structural components. More widespread failures are possible or likely to occur, and load restrictions should be implemented as necessary. Repairs may need to be carried out on a very high-priority basis with strong urgency.

Table 2-14. Condition Assessment Ratings

#### 2.6.2 Condition Assessment Ratings

The Condition Assessment Rating should be assigned upon completion of the routine inspection and remain associated with the structural unit (as defined in Section 3.1.1) until the structure is rerated following a quantitative engineering evaluation and repairs, or upon completion of the next

64

Table 2-6.	Damage Rating	gs for Reinforced	Concrete Elements
	0 0	)	

Dama	age Rating	Existing Damage <sup>a</sup>	Exclusions [Defects Requiring Elevation to the Next Higher Damage Rating(s)]
NI	Not Inspected	• Not inspected, inaccessible, or passed by <sup>b</sup>	
ND	No Defects	• Good original hard surface, hard material, sound	
MN	Minor	<ul> <li>Mechanical abrasion or impact spalls up to 1 in. in depth</li> <li>Occasional corrosion stains or small pop-out corrosion spalls</li> <li>General cracks up to 1/16 in. in width</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Minor damage not appropriate if</li> <li>Structural damage</li> <li>Corrosion cracks</li> <li>Chemical deterioration<sup>c</sup></li> </ul>
MD	Moderate	<ul> <li>Structural cracks up to 1/16 in. in width</li> <li>Corrosion cracks up to 1/4 in. in width</li> <li>Chemical deterioration: Random cracks up to 1/16 in. in width; "Soft" concrete and/or rounding of corners up to 1 in. deep</li> <li>Mechanical abrasion or impact spalls greater than 1 in. in depth</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Moderate damage not appropriate if</li> <li>Structural breakage and/or spalls</li> <li>Exposed reinforcement</li> <li>Loss of cross section due to chemical deterioration beyond rounding of corner edges</li> </ul>

MJ	Major	<ul> <li>Structural cracks 1/16 in. to 1/4 in. in width and partial breakage (through section cracking with structural spalls)</li> <li>Corrosion cracks wider than 1/4 in. and open or closed corrosion spalls (excluding pop-outs)</li> <li>Multiple cracks and disintegration of surface layer due to chemical deterioration</li> <li>Mechanical abrasion or impact spalls exposing the reinforcing</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Major damage not appropriate if</li><li>Loss of cross section exceeding 30% due to any cause</li></ul>	
SV	Severe	<ul> <li>Structural cracks wider than 1/4 in. or complete breakage</li> <li>Complete loss of concrete cover due to corrosion of reinforcing steel with more than 30% of diameter loss for any main reinforcing bar</li> <li>Loss of bearing and displacement at connections</li> <li>Loss of concrete cover (exposed steel) due to chemical deterioration</li> <li>Loss of more 30% of cross section due to any cause</li> </ul>		STANDARDS OF PRACTICE

<sup>a</sup> Any defect listed below is sufficient to identify relevant damage grade. <sup>b</sup>If not inspected due to inaccessibility or passed by, note as such. <sup>c</sup>Chemical deterioration: Sulfate attack, alkali-silica reaction, alkali-aggregate reaction, alkali-carbonate reaction ettringite distress, or other chemical/concrete deterioration.



*Fig.* 2-4. *Damage ratings for reinforced concrete elements Source: Courtesy of CH2M HILL, Inc. and COWI, Inc., reproduced with permission.* 

Dam	age Rating	Existing Damage <sup>a</sup>	Exclusions [Defects Requiring Elevation to the Next Higher Damage Rating(s)]
NI	Not Inspected	<ul> <li>Not inspected, inaccessible, or passed by<sup>b</sup></li> </ul>	
ND	No Defects	<ul> <li>Sound surface material</li> </ul>	
MN	Minor	<ul> <li>Checks, splits, and gouges less than 0.5 in. wide</li> <li>Evidence of marine borers or fungal decay</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Minor damage not appropriate if</li> <li>Loss of cross section</li> <li>Marine borer infestation</li> <li>Displacements, loss of bearing, or connections</li> </ul>
MD	Moderate	<ul> <li>Remaining diameter loss up to 15%</li> <li>Checks and splits wider than 0.5 in.</li> <li>Cross section area loss up to 25%</li> <li>Corroded hardware</li> <li>Evidence of marine borers or fungal decay, with loss of section</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Moderate damage not appropriate if</li><li>Displacements, loss of bearing or connections</li></ul>

# Table 2-4. Damage Ratings for Timber Elements

(Continued)

29
Table 2-4. Damage Ramigs for Timber Lienens (Commune)	Table 2-4.	Damage	Ratings for	r Timber	Elements	(Continued)
---	------------	--------	-------------	----------	----------	-------------

Damage Rating Exis		Existing Damage <sup>a</sup>	Exclusions [Defects Requiring Elevation to the Higher Damage Rating(s)]		
MJ	Major	<ul> <li>Remaining diameter loss 15 to 30%</li> <li>Checks and splits through full depth of cross section</li> <li>Cross-section area loss 25 to 50%; heavily corroded hardware</li> <li>Displacement and misalignments at connections</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Major damage not appropriate if</li><li>Partial or complete breakage</li></ul>		
SV	Severe	<ul> <li>Remaining diameter loss more than 30%</li> <li>Cross section area loss more than 50%</li> <li>Loss of connections and/or fully nonbearing condition</li> <li>Partial or complete breakage</li> </ul>			

<sup>b</sup>If not inspected due to inaccessibility or passed by, note as such.

#### STANDARDS OF PRACTICE



CHECKS, SPLITS AND GOUGES LESS THAN 0.5 INCH WIDE



MINOR

MODERATE

MAJOR

SEVERE

DIAMETER LOSS OF UP TO 15 PERCENT



CHECKS, SPLITS AND GOUGES LESS THAN 0.5 INCH WIDE



CHECKS AND SPLITS WIDER THAN 0.5 INCH



CROSS SECTION LOSS UP TO 25 PERCENT.



LOSS OF 15 TO 30 PERCENT OF DIAMETER



CHECKS AND SPLITS THROUGH CROSS SECTION



CROSS SECTION LOSS 25 TO 50 PERCENT

COMPLETE BREAKAGE



FULLY NON- BEARING



CROSS SECTION LOSS EXCEEDING 50 PERCENT

*Fig.* 2-2. Condition ratings for timber elements Source: Courtesy of CH2M HILL, Inc. and COWI, Inc., reproduced with permission. 31

ABBREVIATION	TERM	ABBREVIATION	TERM					
	FOOT	MJ	MAJOR					
"	INCH	ML	MUDLINE					
BAT, BATT	BATTER	MLW	MEAN LOW WATER					
BLW	BELOW	MN	MINOR					
BTM	BOTTOM	Ν	NORTH					
BTW	BETWEEN	ND	NO DAMAGE					
CONC	CONCRETE	NE	NORTHEAST					
CR	CORROSION	NI	NOT INSPECTED					
CRNR	CORNER	NW	NORTHWEST					
CS	CORROSION STAIN	S	SOUTH					
DIA	DIAMETER	SE	SOUTHEAST					
E	EAST	SF	SQUARE FOOT					
EFF	EFFLORESCENCE	SL	SECTION LOSS					
ENC	ENCASEMENT	SV	SEVERE					
GEN	GENERAL	SW	SOUTHWEST					
Н	HORIZONTAL	SX	SECTION (CROSS SECTION)					
HC	HORIZONTAL CRACK	SZ	SPLASH ZONE					
HDW	HARDWARE	TYP	TYPICAL					
HT	HEIGHT	TZ	TIDAL ZONE					
HVY	HEAVY	V	VERTICAL					
LT LIGHT		VC	VERTICAL CRACK					
MB MARINE BORER		W	WEST					
MD	MODERATE	W/	WITH					
MHW	MEAN HIGH WATER	WL	WATERLINE					
MID, MW	MIDWATER							

### **ABBREVIATION KEY**



Appendix E Record Drawings







## AS BUILT

QUANTITIES

1. Handrail Removal, Replacm. 2. Handrail Sandblasting 3. Trash Receptacles 4. Banches 5. Drinking Fountains AH.A. Observation Platform C.C.D. #1. Furnish & Install 600 Carriage Bolts C.C.O. #2. Furnish & Install Lumber & Bolts

FINAL

Ls #	32,000,00
L.S.	2,400.00
34 ca. @ \$175.00	5,950.00
30 eq. @ 300.00	9,000.00
2 eq. @ 500.00	1,000.00
1.5.	21,000.00
	250.10

TOTAL

151.00 \$ 71, 751.00

CONTRACTOR	1	MSGUIRE & Hester
INSPECTOR	;	H Petersen
Job Awarded	;	8-1-72
Job Completed		
& Accepted	;	3-21-73
Contract Compl. Dat	台	
Incl. Extensions	;	3-29-73

GENERAL NOTE:

23

NTS + Nor To Scale

AS BUILT

FISHING PIER IMPROVEMENTS MISC. TABLES & DETAILS	DESIGN DRAWN CHECK AS BUILT	TK EED W.O.	HORIZ. VERT. BOOK DATE	As Noted	PLAN FILE SHEET	<u>6049</u> 4 <u>05-81</u> 3_0F_6
---	--------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------	----------	-----------------------	---















FINAL QUANTITIES Item Description Quantitier Unit Prical Value Lump Sum 12,160 12,160.00 Deck removal 2 45.021.00 1047 43.00 Rein. conc. deck 3 8.532.00 4.00 Hand rail 2133 4 5.760.00 Brace piler 6.00 960 2.000.00 5 Fish clean table 2000 Lump Sum End Clearance SAN FRANCISCO BAY 1,500.00 6 Lump Sum 1,500 \$ 74,973.00 Total Contract Completion date: April 15, 1962 Contractor: J.H. McCosker Work completed : June 3, 1962 AREA Field Inspector: T.D.Edwards. YACHT HARBOR Q. FISHING PIER EXTENSION PORTION CLOSED END CLEARANCE Bent No's are as Designated on Original 1927 Plans OF Pier Built by S.F. Bridge Co For Golden Gate Ferry Co. **AS BUILT** Stations Nored are GGF Co data. APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: DATE: 9-5-61 SLAB DETAILS ARE Clare & Gagnon ON PLAN 3631 NEER 8561 FOR 1ST SECT. SEE : ATE: 9-5-61 FILE Nº 503-105 Plan - 3155 102 13-57 CTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER, NO. 740











APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: DATE: 9-5-61 lare Jagnon 8561 DATE: 9-5-61 APPR DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER, NO. 7409 CITY OF BERKELEY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FISHING PIER ADDITIONS ANING DESIGN : B.H. DATE : 1-23-59 BH. DRAWN PLAN : 3549 FILE 102-8-63 Sht. 6 of 7







1.

and feature and state



GHD Inc

655 Montgomery Street, Suite 1010 San Francisco, CA 94111 T: 415 283 4970 F: 415 283 4980 E: sanfrancisco@ghd.com

#### © GHD Inc 2017

This document is and shall remain the property of GHD. The document may only be used for the purpose of assessing our offer of services and for inclusion in documentation for the engagement of GHD. Unauthorized use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

#### **Document Status**

Rev	Author	Reviewer		Approved for Issue		
No.		Name	Signature	Name	Signature	Date

# www.ghd.com

