



Tunnels, Bridges & Terminals Department

Outerbridge Crossing - Main Span Pier and Fender Upgrades - Contract AKO-284.051

RESPONSE#12 TO QUESTIONS FROM BIDDERS

Updated: March 13, 2018

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
001a	01/22/18	We request an extension of the bid deadline for "Contract No. AKO-284.051 – Outerbridge Crossing."	See Addendum No. 1 dated 1/26/18.
001b		Are the bid documents available yet?	For availability of contract documents, see the Port Authority's website: <a href="http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/bid-proposal-advertisements.html">http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/bid-proposal-advertisements.html</a>
002	01/30/18	formally requests a four (4) week extension to the current bid due-date of Feb 15, 2018 on the above referenced project for the following rational:	See Addendum No. 3 dated 2/5/18.
		1. Since the project was initially advertised on January 18, 2018, , Inc. has been diligently working with the PANYNJ at completing the required Information Security Requirements and as well as Safe Worker Access Consortium Requirements. We anticipate having a completed the required submittals for this within the next 24 hours as we are now sending our nominated Security Information Manager to NY to complete the SWAC Process.	
		2. It is understood that the bid package cannot be released to Inc. until such time as the complete review and approval of the information security requirements and SWAC are completed.	
		3. Given a review period by PANYNJ for the ISR and SWAC and the subsequent release of the bid package to Cashman, it is anticipated that insufficient time will be remaining to put together a compliant and competitive response, given the current bid due date of Feb 15.	
003		Inc. is currently under contract with the PANYNJ on a maintenance dredging contract and has worked for the PANYNJ in the past on previous contracts. We have enjoyed a very positive working relationship with the PANYNJ and appreciate that this specific contract has a heightened security requirement and we certainly will comply, but feel that it is only fair to give some additional time to evaluate the bid package considering the pre-bid release security requirements.	
004	01/30/18	Good afternoon. Thank you for your assistance in guiding us in the right direction for receiving our approvals to bid this work. As you know, the SWAC approval process isn't an overnight event and will take anywhere from 1 ½ - 2 weeks. That is the reason I am writing you this email. would like to officially request a 4 week postponement of the bid date. We will bid the job once approved but not sure we can do so with the short time frame that is now allotted. We hopeful that you will consider our request. Thank you for your time.	See Addendum No. 3 dated 2/5/18.
005	02/01/18	1) We have recently been approved to bid on the referenced project. Due to the size and complexity of the project, we request an extension of 2 weeks to the bid opening of February 15 <sup>th</sup> . to allow us to get the required information to vendors and subcontractors in order to put a comprehensive bid together.	See Addendum No. 3 dated 2/5/18.
006a	02/01/18	1) On page 2 of 2 on the "Analysis of Bid", of the spec. book, Items 15 and 17 (Pier D Floatable Walkway) appear to be the same. Please confirm.	See Notice to Bidders dated 2/5/18.
006b		2) On Drawing S106, "Existing Timber Fender System" shows the existing timber fender attached to the steel cofferdam with SS studs. Our question is: Can the existing SS studs that appear to be welded on the steel cofferdam be re-used to attach the new composite fender system?	Refer to Note 2. On Contract Drawing S106.

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
		Under the Special Conditions within the Permitting section of the specifications and Note B) on G005, states, that if there is a presence of nesting falcon, no work is permitted between the period of March 1 <sup>st</sup> through July 15 <sup>th</sup> . Our Question Is: 1) will this time of no work be added to the contract period for completion? Also, if the contractor is required to stop work due to the falcon nesting, will the contractor be compensated for demobilization and remobilization of the contractor's operation?	Refer to the first sentence of Note 3. on Contract Drawing G005, the Contract Book, Page 49, Clause 37, and Page 150, Section 112.A.1."
007a	02/05/18	1) Note 4 on G005 states "The USCG may require the contractor to clear the navigational channel to accommodate the passage of Large Ships". How will the contractor get compensated for moving his operation?	Refer to the Contract Book, Page 150, Section 112.A.1.
008a	02/07/18	1) The project requires the contractor to work under the bridge on all 3 piers. What is the minimum distance the contractor is allowed with the boom of the crane to the under decking?	Refer to the first and fifth paragraphs of Clause 92 on Page 103 and the thirteenth paragraph of Clause 92 on Page 104 of the Contract Book.
008b		2) Note 3. Piles, subsection 3.04 on drawing S001, states the following: "The contractor shall also propose locations for dynamic testing of one walkway pile at each pier for a total of 3 dynamic tests at each pier for approval by the engineer". Are understanding being that there is one test at each walkway pier at 3 piers for a total of 3 tests, not 3 ea. at each pier. Please confirm the number required on the 16" diameter piles.	This will be answered by Addendum. 3/2/18 - See Addendum No. 6 dated March 2, 2018.
009a	02/08/18	1. What is the thickness of the 4"x4" angles used on the cofferdam fender system, sheet S106?	See Reference Dwg. No. S-2 of Contract No. AKO-159.
009b		2. What is the size of the splice channel in the "wale splice detail" on sheet S107?	No change to Contract Drawing. Bid as shown.
009c		3. Are the holes countersunk in the in the composite timber fender, at the pile connection bolts?	This will be answered by Addendum. 3/2/18 - See Addendum No. 6 dated March 2, 2018.
009d		4. Is the Authority aware that with the 4" and 11" vertical spacing between rows of the composite timber wale, the splice bolts cannot be easily removed and replaced for maintenance purposes?	No change to Contract Drawing. Bid as shown.
010a	02/09/18	1) Note 4 on G005 states "The USCG may require the contractor to clear the navigational channel to accommodate the passage of Large Ships". How will the contractor get compensated for moving his operation?	Refer to the Contract Book, Page 150, Section 112.A.1.
010b		2) Will the contractor be able to sit in the navigational channel along either Pier C or Pier D to drive the piles and install the composite wale system on the piles?	Refer to the Contract Book, Page 150, Sections 112.A.1. and 112.A.2., and Page 151, Clause 113.
011	02/12/18	The response to question 6b states to refer to note 2 on contract drawing S106. Note 2 on S106 states "the contractor shall use the same attachment details to attach the composite fenders to cofferdam." This note is not clear as to whether the studs should be reused or new. Please clarify, should the studs be reused or do new studs need to be installed.	This will be answered by Addendum. 3/2/18 - See Addendum No. 6 dated March 2, 2018.
012	02/13/18	In regards to the above referenced Contract AKO-284.051, please clarify if / where the PANY&NJ will provide access and storage for the Contractor's use to build this project. If no access or storage is designated, will the Contractor be permitted to access the work through the Right Of Way? Please provide any ROW survey and/or geometry if access and storage will be permitted through the ROW.	Refer to the Contract Book, Page 89, Clause 77 and Page 150, Section 112.A.4.
013	02/15/18	Thank you for your assistance in helping us procure the bid documents. Since we have just received them, I would like to formally ask for a 2 week extension of the bid date. Thank you for your consideration.	The request for a further bid extension will not be granted at this time.
014a	02/20/18	1. Please confirm the pipe pile acceptance criteria consists of achieving both the minimum pile tip elevation <i>and</i> the minimum energy transfer development at the pile top. If yes, is it the intent of the contract that the contractor assumes all costs associated with efforts to install piles below the given minimum tip elevations if the pile capacity is below acceptance, or are the additional efforts compensable independent of the lump sum?	Refer to Contract Book Specification Section 02365, pages 162 through 164, Section 3.01.E.

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
014b		2. Specification Section 02491, Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic Composite Marine Fender Timber, directs the contractor to install the fender system "in accordance with manufacturer's guidelines and as noted in the Owners Field Guide". No direction is provided regarding the location and quantity of fender joints. Please confirm that there are no restrictions on joint location and quantity provided construction is consistent with the manufacturer's guidelines and Owner's Field Guide for installation.	No change to the Contract Documents. Bid as shown.
014c		3. The steel pile cap detail on Drawing S107 shows the cap plate is secured to the top of pile with angle retainers welded to the cap plate, but does not show a weldment between the cap plate and the pipe pile at the seam. Please confirm that the cap plate is not welded to the pipe pile.	Bid as shown.
014d		4. The contract drawings do not dictate the method for creating the holes in the pipe piles to support the fender. Please confirm if the holes are to be mechanically drilled only, or if flame cutting is allowed.	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/6/18 - Refer to Note 2.08 on Contract Drawing S001.</b>
014e		5. The detail of the fender splice on Drawing S107 shows 8 each 1-5/8" fiberglass reinforcing elements cast in the 12"x12" timber. A similar detail is not provided for the new 10"x10" members that replace the wood timber at the existing circular fenders. Please confirm the same quantity and size of reinforcing is to be used for the 10"x10" timbers or please provide a separate detail.	Refer to Contract Book Specification Section 02491, page 182, Section 2.01.D.2.
014f		6. Drawing S106 shows 8"x8" blocking between the 10"x10" vertical timbers. Please confirm if fiberglass reinforcing is required in the 8"x8" blocking. If yes, please confirm if the detail provided on Drawing S107 applies or provide a separate detail.	Refer to Contract Book Specification Section 02491, page 182, Section 2.01.D.2.
014g		7. Please confirm if the intent is reuse the existing 7/8" diameter studs to support the new 10"x10" composite timbers at the circular fenders, or if new studs are required.	This will be answered by Addendum. 3/2/18 - See Addendum No. 6 dated March 2, 2018.
015a	02/20/18	a. 12x12 members are stated to have (8) 1.625" FRP rebar imbedded within them, is this also true of the 10x10 members for the cofferdam fenders?	Refer to Contract Book Specification Section 02491, page 182, Section 2.01.D.2.
015b		b. Do the short spacers for the cofferdam fenders have FRP rebar within them?	Refer to Contract Book Specification Section 02491, page 182, Section 2.01.D.2.
015c		c. The Mechanical Properties stated in the specifications, are they for the 12x12 wales or the 10x10 fenders, or both? If each section has unique properties please provide the property requirements for the alternate section.	Refer to Contract Book Specification Section 02491, pages 180 and 181, Section 2.01.B. and "TABLE I PLASTIC (TYPICAL PROPERTIES)"
016a		2. Sheet S104	
		a. The radius of the fender surrounding Pier E appears to be 85'. The radiused portion of the fender appears to show short (15'-20'), straight segments of composite wale. Is the intention to use short segments with mitered end cuts on the wales, or should the 12"x12" composite wales be bent in the field to the required radius?	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/5/18 - See Addendum No. 7 dated March 5, 2018.</b>
017a		3. Sheet S106	
		a. The existing timber fender system around the coffer dam shows 10x10 vertical timbers and a horizontal timber in between. The drawing does not identify the dimensions of the horizontal timber, but it appears to be an 8"x8" timber. Please confirm the size of the horizontal composite timber required. Also, should the horizontal timber be treated wood or fiberglass reinforced composite timbers?	First Question: See Reference Dwg. No. S-2 of Contract No. AKO-159. Second Question: Refer to upper right callout of "EXISTING COFFERDAM – ELEVATION" on Contract Dwg. No. S105.
018a		4. Sheet S107	

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
		a. There's a wale splice channel shown on the drawing, but no detail is provided as to whether the splice channel is to be fiberglass or steel. The composite wale manufacturer provides a fiberglass splice channel that has been used on previous projects that they claim will offer a much longer service life than a steel splice channel. Are the splice channels intended to be fiberglass as provided by the composite wale manufacturer?	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/7/18 - See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018</b>
019		5. Sheet S110	
019a		a. Fender Platform – Additional details needed for platform deck framing, size of grating, handrail connections, and connection to galvanized channels.	See Note 6.02 on Contract Dwg. G003 and Note 1 of "S-2 SECTION" on Contract Dwg. S110.
019b		b. Walkway to Falcon Nest – Additional details needed to show walkway deck framing, and grating. Member sizes for handrails and framing also needed.	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/7/18 - See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018</b>
020	02/21/18	Can you send me a list of MWBE contractors that have received Port Authority security training and are qualified to receive Confidential information? Addendum #5 for the above referenced project has raised the MWBE goals.	The Port Authority does not have such a list.
021	02/22/18	What are the anticipated Contract, NTP and Start Date for this project?	Refer to the Contract Book, Page 6, Clause 5.
022a		Is there a Buy American Clause on this project?	Bid as per Contract Book.
022b		Will the PANYNJ consider spiral welded pipe as an alternate?	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/9/18 - See Addendum No. 10 dated March 8, 2018</b>
023	02/22/18	The response received to the question regarding allowable access and storage of materials within the right of way cited Clause 77 and Section 112.A.4 for clarification. Those cited descriptions allow for occupancy at the area of work during work hours only and storage in permanent areas of work only. The permanent area of work is within open waters of the Arthur Kill. No storage of materials is permitted on the existing piers as per notes on the plans. Access from the shoreline within the ROW for delivery of materials & equipment and for access & egress of workers (especially in the event of emergency) is a basic requirement for construction of facilities. It is unrealistic to expect bidders to source and negotiate local private access and yard facilities within the timeframe permitted to submit this bid. The PANY&NJ failing to provide a means of access could prevent some bidders from being able to submit their bid and therefore provides an unfair bidding advantage. Please provide confirmation access to the water can be gained through the right of way and confirm materials and equipment can be stored within the right of way other than in the area of permanent improvements. Alternately, the PANY&NJ must provide an allowance item for the cost of securing private access to ensure no bidders are excluded or benefit from an unfair advantage.	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/9/18 - See Addendum No. 10 dated March 8, 2018</b>
024	02/22/18	Unfortunately, despite multiple attempts, <u>we have been unable to access the database.</u> Each time, the browser returns an error message stating that we cannot connect securely to the page, and that the authenticity of the received data could not be verified. This error message recommends that we contact the website's owner to inform them of the problem.	For Engineering Qualified M/W/SBE Construction Contractor Search, see the

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
		Can you look into this matter for us? It is affecting our ability to meet our requirements under the MINORITY AND WOMEN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISES PROGRAM for this project.	Port Authority's website: <a href="https://panynj.diversitysoftware.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchReference.asp">https://panynj.diversitysoftware.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchReference.asp</a>
025	02/22/18	<u>As part of our effort to meet good faith goals of 20 percent for firms owned and controlled by minorities and 10 percent for firms owned and controlled by women, our Purchasing Department has been trying to access the Mini-Profile database system to identify potential subcontractors and suppliers for the project (<a href="http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/sd-mini-profile.html">http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/sd-mini-profile.html</a>)</u>	For Engineering Qualified M/W/SBE Construction Contractor Search, see the Port Authority's website: <a href="https://panynj.diversitysoftware.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchReference.asp">https://panynj.diversitysoftware.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchReference.asp</a>
026	02/22/18	Because of the security requirements surrounding this project, we just received the bid package today. Can the bid date be extended by 2 weeks so that we have an opportunity to bid this project?	The request for a further bid extension will not be granted at this time.
027a	02/28/18	1. Do all potential vendor and subcontractors, including M/WBEs, need SWAC to have access to protected materials?	Refer to Port Authority Information Security Handbook, Page 8, Section 3.1 "Applicability", and Port Authority Information Security Requirements, Section III.A. "Requirements".
027b		2. In the Port Authority's Information Security Handbook, Section 3.2, the first paragraphs after the 2 bullet points on page 9 says; "The individual's name must be entered on the appropriate department, or Port Authority Authorized Personnel Clearance List for access to Confidential and/or Confidential Privileged Information. See Sec. 3.9 for more information regarding this List (Note: If an individual's name does not appear on the appropriate Authorized Personnel Clearance List, access must be denied)." Please provide a copy of the appropriate Authorized Personnel Clearance List for the Outerbridge Fender project, to be used to solicit material and subcontractor quotes.	<b>The bidder will be provided with the Records of Document Issued Log.</b>
028a		1) Note 3.02 on Contract Dwg S001 states that the 36" pipe piles shall be driven to min. tip elevation of -102 feet except for the piles on the east side of Pier "D" between cofferdams #1 and #4, which will be driven to min. tip elevation of -122 feet. Please clarify if the minimum tip elevation of -122 applies to ALL piles East of cofferdams #1 and #4 or if it is only referring to the piles BETWEEN cofferdams #1 and #4.	We request clarification from the bidder on this question.
028b		2) Note 3.04 on Contract Drawing S001 states that the contractor shall propose locations for dynamic testing of one walkway pile at each pier for a total of 3 dynamic tests at each pier. Please clarify/confirm if 3 total dynamic tests will be performed on the 16" piles or if it will be 3 at each pier for a total of 9 locations	See Addendum No. 6 dated March 2, 2018.
028c		3) Are the 1" dia. S.S. pile-to-wale anchor bolts countersunk into the composite timbers?	See Addendum No. 6 dated March 2, 2018.
028d		4) Please confirm that at the locations where the existing cofferdam timber fenders are to be replaced with new composite fenders, they will maintain the same dimensions. Meaning the 10"x10" timber fenders will be replaced with 10"x10" composite fenders and the 8"x8" timber fenders will be replaced with 8"x8" composite fenders. Or is it the Port Authorities intent to replace all the 10"x10" and 8"x8" timbers with 12"x12" composite fenders? The Contract Book Specification Section 02491, page 182, Section 2.01.D.2 only shows 12"x12" FRP's.	<b>This will be answered by Addendum. 3/9/18 - See Addendum No. 10 dated March 8, 2018</b>

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
029	03/01/18	1) On drawing S001, under 3. PILES, section 3.01.B, states" Vibratory Hammer may be used for initial set". Our question is, how far can the pile be driven with the vibratory hammer before impacting? Is there a certain footage before pile tip that the contractor must stop the driving of the pile with the vibratory hammer?	<b>3/9/18 - See Addendum No. 10 dated March 8, 2018</b>
030	03/01/18	1) It has been brought to our attention from several pipe suppliers, that the 16" diameter x 1" wall for the floating walkways at the three piers are not available. The wall thickness of 1" thickness is the problem for that size diameter pipe. Please advise.	<b>No change to Contract Documents. Bid as shown.</b>
031a	03/02/18	1) Table 1 on Page S105 shows the limits of fender removal and fender replacement on the existing cofferdams. Note 2 on Page S102 refers to this table for replacement fender limits. However the removal/replacement limits on the plans do not seem to match up with the limits shown on the plans. For example, the table appears to show that no fender is required at cofferdam 3, but a fender is shown for the location on page S103. The table also shows 43' of removal/replacement for both cofferdams 2 and 6. But looking at plan sheet S102 cofferdam 2 appears to need almost double the amount of fender as cofferdam 4. Please review and clarify if the table or the plans govern the limits of cofferdam replacement and correct the plans as needed.	<b>Bid as shown on Table 1, Contract Drawing S105.</b>
031b		2) Please clarify if the 36" and 16" pipe pile diameter is the outside diameter (OD) or the inside diameter (ID) as it is not shown on the plans or referenced in the specifications.	<b>See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018.</b>
032		1) The Analysis of Bid includes an item for Conical Polyethylene Caps 36" Dia, but does not include an item for Conical Polyethylene Caps 16" Dia, despite the detail on Plan Page S110 showing conical caps for both 36" and 16" piles. Please clarify whether or not 16" Conical Pile Caps are required, and if so, please include an item in the Analysis of Bid.	Bid as shown for "CONICAL POLYETHYLENE CAP" detail on Contract Drawing S110. See Notice to Bidders dated March 7, 2018 for revised Analysis of Bid. <b>3/12/18 - See Notice to Bidders dated March 9, 2018 for revised Analysis of Bid.</b>
033	03/02/18	-Because of recent unanswered questions and anticipated addenda, we would like to formally ask for a two week extension of the bid date.	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
034	03/02/18	The drawings on pages S-102 to 104 show security gates on the 3 floatable walkways. There are no details or specifications regarding this item. Please provide this information and indicate which item the security gates will be paid under.	<b>See "SECURITY GATE" detail on Contract Drawing S109. Bid as shown.</b>
035	03/02/18	We would like to request an extension of bid due date for one week to be able to submit a bid that best serve the interest of your great organization. Thank you,	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
036	03/02/18	- Can an allowance bid item be added for steel price escalation?	<b>No change to the Contract Documents. Bid as shown.</b>
037	03/02/18	1) The Wale Splice section on Plan Page S107 shows 1.25" dia stainless threaded bars, however the spare parts listed in Spec Section 02491 show 1.25" dia stainless bolts. Please clarify if the wales should be spliced with threaded rod, or if bolts should be used.	<b>This will be answered by addendum. "See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018."</b>
038	03/02/18	In regards to the replacement of Existing Cofferdam Timber Fender with Composite Fenders, how many linear feet will be replaced on Cofferdam #3? Table 1 on Contract Drawing S105 says N/A. Does this mean Cofferdam #3 will not require any replacement of timber fenders with composite fenders, even though it appears to be within the scope of work?	<b>Bid as shown on Table 1, Contract Drawing S105.</b>
039	03/05/18	!) Please be advised that the last set of questions answered were on Feb. 27, 2018. In those set of questions, eight (8) were responded with "To be addressed by Addendum". To date we have not received any addendums, in addition to other questions that were not posted or answered to date. With the bid date this Thursday, a postponement of the project should be addressed so that the contractor can review the responses and forward the same to vendors and subcontractors. In addition, with the upcoming storm that is to hit the NY/NJ area	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>



QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
040a	03/05/18	1) Part 4 of the Information for Bidders requires that bidders submit six hardcopies and one flash drive of the qualification information <u>with the bid</u> , however, there is no reference to this requirement in Part 3- Papers Accompanying Bids. Please confirm that the qualification information is not required to be submitted with the bid, similar to the Port Authority's past practices, and revise the language in Part 4 accordingly.	<b>Refer to the Contract Book, Page 2, Paragraph A. of Clause 3. entitled "PAPERS ACCOMPANYING BIDS" and Addendum No. 3 dated February 5, 2018.</b>
040b		2) Note 2.07 on drawing S001 mentions ultrasonic testing of welds. Please clarify if the Port Authority requires ultrasonic testing of the pipe pile splice welds.	<b>3/9/18 - See Addendum No. 10 dated March 8, 2018</b>
040c		3) Note 8 on S101 states that all piles to be capped with conical poly caps except those used to support access platforms and navigational lights- which are to be capped with the steel plate detail on S107. Based on these notes, and the item descriptions provided in Analysis of Bid forms, there is confusion of exactly what is required on the tops of the piles. Item 7 on the Analysis of Bid is for Steel Plate Caps 16" Dia, however none of the 16" piles support access platforms or navigational lights. Please confirm that conical caps shall be used on the 16" piles per the detail on S110 and revise the description of Item 7 to Conical Polyethylene Caps 16" Dia. And please clarify that the steel plate caps are only required on the twelve (12) 36" piles that support the platforms and lights.	Response to second to last sentence: See Notice to Bidders dated March 7, 2018 for revised Analysis of Bid. Response to last sentence: No change to Contract Drawings. Bid as shown. <b>3/12/18 - See Notice to Bidders dated March 9, 2018 for revised Analysis of Bid.</b>
041a	03/05/18	We received addendum #6 this morning via FedEx with the associated CD for transmittal of the revised/updated drawings. Unfortunately, the CD was broken during shipping (see attached picture). With this in mind, we respectfully request the following: 1. Please send out a new Addendum #6 CD ASAP. Alternatively, is there a way that we can download the revised drawings securely and avoid the anticipated delay of awaiting a new FedEx to reach us?	<b>Replacement CD sent via overnight mail on 3/5/18.</b>
041a	03/05/18	1. Will there be, or is there, a steel adjustment clause for this project? There is very high instability in the steel market now due to the recent implementation of federal tariffs.	<b>No change to the Contract Documents. Bid as shown.</b>
041b		2. In consideration of the delay to receipt of the new CD, will the Contracting Department consider an extension to the bid date for a day or so to allow-us to evaluate the revised drawings and react accordingly? Alternatively, if there is a way that the documents can be transmitted electronically today – we can forgo a request for extension.	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
042a	03/05/18	1. Will there be, or is there, a steel adjustment clause for this project? There is very high instability in the steel market now due to the recent implementation of federal tariffs.	<b>No change to the Contract Documents. Bid as shown.</b>
042b		2. Previous questions 008b, 009c, 011, 014d, 014g, 016a, 018a, and 019b were answered by stating "Will be addressed by Addendum" in the Bidder's Questions Log on the PANYNJ website. I did not see any clarification to these questions in addendum 1 through 5. Will there be another addendum issued prior to bid date this Thursday? Is there a later version of the Bidder's Questions Log than 2/27/2018?	<b>For additional addendums and updates to the Bidder's Questions Log, see the Port Authority's website: <a href="http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/bid-proposal-advertisements.html">http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/bid-proposal-advertisements.html</a>.</b>
043	03/05/18	Good morning. I have received Addendum #6 via mail. Unfortunately, the cd is cracked. I have left messages for Mr. Greer & Mr. Cartagena but haven't heard anything back from them. Do you know if I will need to come pick up a new cd or if one can be sent overnight?	<b>Replacement CD sent via overnight mail on 3/5/18.</b>
044	03/05/18	I have one additional urgent question/concern that has been brought to my attention by our steel suppliers: 1) The Trump administration has recently proposed a 25% tariff on imported Steel. If enacted, this will drastically increase the price of materials on this project. Given the timing of the bid, there is no way to know if and how much the price of steel will increase as a result of this tariff. If the price of steel is to rise significantly after the bid date, will the Port Authority approve a request for reimbursement of the additional costs?"	<b>No change to the Contract Documents. Bid as shown.</b>

QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
045	03/05/18	The purpose of my question was to get clarification on which piles require a minimum tip elevation of -102' and which piles require a minimum tip elevation of -122'. Note 3.02 on Contract Drawing S001 implies that the piles <u>between</u> Cofferdams #1 and #4 require a minimum tip elevation of -122', however there doesn't appear to be any piles between Cofferdams #1 and #4.	<b>3/9/18 - See Addendum No. 10 dated March 8, 2018</b>
	03/05/18	-We are in receipt of Addendum #6 which addressed <u>some</u> of the questions posted but not all. Please be advised that the following questions as posted on the website under the "Bidder's Questions Log 8 27-Feb-2018" that were answered as "To be addressed by Addendum" were not addressed.	
		Questions not addressed:	
046a		1) 014d	<b>Refer to Note 2.08 on Contract Drawing S001.</b>
046b		2) 016a	<b>See Addendum No. 7 dated March 5, 2018.</b>
046c		3) 018a	<b>See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018.</b>
046d		4) 019b	<b>See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018.</b>
046e		Please advise as when the PA intends to answer these questions by addendum and other questions sent in that have not been posted to the Log.	<b>See responses above for answers to those questions. For updates to the Bidder's Questions Log, see the Port Authority's website: <a href="http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/bid-proposal-advertisements.html">http://www.panynj.gov/business-opportunities/bid-proposal-advertisements.html</a>.</b>
47	03/06/18	I am writing to request a postponement of the Outerbridge Main span pier and fender upgrade project. The reason for this is that on Friday March 2 our office lost power, phone and internet because of the storm of that day and we have not have it restored yet and currently neither CoEd or Verizon can give us a time of when it is going to be restored. This can be verified with ConEdison storm center for our office address of 335 Center Ave Mamaroneck. In addition there was an addendum #6 mailed out March 2 that was received by us yesterday March 5 three days before the bid date. Also there is a storm predicted for tonight and I don't know how this will affect the situation but I am sure it won't help. We want to submit a competitive, responsible bid on this project and a postponement would help us and I am sure other contractors do just that.	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
48	03/06/18	Due to the forecasted Nor'easter that has been projected to bring 6"-12" of snow between this Wednesday March 7 <sup>th</sup> & this Thursday March 8 <sup>th</sup> , would the Port Authority consider postponing the bid date by 1 week in order to ensure that all interested bidders are able to safely submit their bids in time.	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
49	03/06/18	We have received Addendum #6 and the associated drawings and are adjusting accordingly. Based on the Bidder's Questions Log 8 posted online, and dated Feb 27, 2018 there are still a number of questions that the response indicates will be addressed by addendum; specifically questions 014d, 016a, 018a, and 019b. Is this addendum forthcoming, and will the bid be postponed to allow these questions to be addressed?	<b>Question 014b - Refer to Note 2.08 on Contract Drawing S001. Question 016a - See Addendum No. 7 dated March 5, 2018. Questions 018a and 019b - See Addendum No. 9 dated March 7, 2018. Bid Postponement - See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
50	03/06/18	In follow-up to our e-mail below from yesterday, we still have not received the replacement Addendum #6 CD. However, we did receive Addendum #7 today (inclusive of a CD) which we're currently reviewing. Again, for the reasons noted below, we respectfully request a day-for-day extension to the bid date to allow us to receive the Addendum #6 information and review appropriately. As of today, we would request a two day extension.	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>



QUES	DATE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
51	03/06/18	Due the adverse effect to our estimating dept the impending winter storm forecasted for Wed-Thu this week will have, D'Onofrio respectfully requests a bid due date extension to Tuesday next week. We are anticipating most of the dept will not be reporting into work those days, or able to be on the road to deliver the bid. Please advise ASAP if granted or not.	<b>See Addendum No. 8 dated 3/6/18.</b>
		We are in receipt of Addendum #9, with the following questions:	
52a	03/08/18	1) A new "Analysis of Bid" was sent with the addendum. Why are there 2 Pier D Floatable Walkways (Item 15 and Item 17)? There is only one Pier D walkway. This was corrected in a previous addendum.	<b>See Notice to Bidders dated 3/9/18.</b>
52b		2) " <b>Changes to the Contract Drawings</b> ". First change on Drawing S001, regarding inserting the note at the end of Note 3.12. "THE 36" AND 12" DIAMETER STEEL PILE.....". <b>There are no 12" diameter steel piles on this project.</b> Please advise or correct.	<b>See Addendum No. 11 dated 3/9/18.</b>
53a	03/08/18	1. In Addendum #9 received today, a new Analysis of Bid was provided. This document has different unit numbers than that of the Analysis of Bid that was provided in Addendum #3. Item number 15 and number 17 have the same description. Can you please clarify?	<b>See Notice to Bidders dated 3/9/18.</b>
53b		2. In Addendum #9 received today, note 3.13 added to Dwg-S001 references a 12" diameter steel piles. Should that actually refer to the 16" piles?	<b>See Addendum No. 11 dated 3/9/18.</b>
54	03/09/18	On the "Analysis Of Bid" – Items 15 and 17 are identical. We would like to ask for the reasoning behind providing the same item twice or for a revision to the form. Thank you.	<b>See Notice to Bidders dated 3/9/18.</b>
	03/09/18	Addendum 9 received by fax yesterday:	
055a		We can't seem to find any indication in Plan view of where this small gangway to the Falcon nest goes. Does this gangway comprise the entirety of the bid line item #18 "Pier D Falcon Walkway"? Can you issue a sketch to indicate?	<b>Refer to "CHANNEL LAYOUT PLAN" on Contract Drawing S101 and "PIER "D" PLAN" on Contract Drawing S103.</b>
055b		Also, note the Bid form in the Addendum has duplicate line items 15 and 17. UOD, we'll strike #15 from our form.	<b>See Notice to Bidders dated 3/9/18.</b>
56	03/13/18	The domestic and foreign steel markets are experiencing high volatility and rising prices, due to recent announcements regarding the imposition of tariffs on foreign steel. As the authority is aware, the steel is a substantial component of this project and that volatility has made this a very risky project to bid. This has become a major factor in determining whether we decide to bid or not bid on this project. Will the Port Authority reconsider their response on the steel price adjustment for this project?	<b>No change to the Contract Documents. Bid as shown.</b>