



QUESTIONS FROM BIDDERS LOG #8

PAT-774.176 Replacement of Approach Slabs and Pavement at Harrison Car Maintenance Facility

Updated: 12/6/18

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
1	<p>Section "F" of Contract Clause #9 – DBE Program requires all bidders to submit with their bids several DBE Forms/Appendices that are found in the back of the Contract Booklet and which are to be used by the bidders to document the DBE Program being offered by the bidders. We protest the requirement for all bidders to submit these DBE Forms with their bid. No other regional transportation agency requires this very onerous and unreasonable task to be performed by all bidders, and this requirement is not consistent with past Port Authority practice that typically requires only the low bidder to submit these types of forms within a reasonable amount of time after the bids are submitted. Most bidders are not able to submit these completed DBE Forms with their bids because of several practical reasons: (1) most bidders do not have the time or the resources to devote to this very time-consuming and onerous task prior to the submittal of their bids; (2) typically, most bidders do not receive prices from subcontractors and vendors until the day before the bids are submitted (when we are lucky), and often-times the prices are not received until the morning of the day that bids are submitted, which means that most bidders do not typically have sufficient time or the wherewithal before the bids are submitted to be able to determine which DBE Firms and which Non-DBE Firms will be selected for the project; (3) since there is not sufficient time prior to the submittal of bids for most bidders to determine which DBE Firms and Non-DBE Firms will be selected for the project, there is not sufficient time to fill-out and submit the DBE Forms with the bids; and, (4) due to these time-related constraints and logistical issues, the bidders certainly do not have the time to obtain the original signatures that are required from pre-selected DBE Firms for the execution and submittal of the DBE Form called Appendix A2. Therefore, for all of the above reasons we request revisions to Contract Clause #9 that require only the identified low bidder to submit the DBE Forms within the standard period of 7 calendar days after the low bidder is identified by the Port Authority.</p>	Bid as per Contract Documents.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
2	<p>The Contract Booklet includes a DBE Form called Appendix A3 – Modified DBE Participation and Affirmation Statement, but the Contract Booklet does not provide any explanation or instructions regarding the purpose of this form and why this form would need to be submitted by a bidder. Also, Appendix A3 is not included in the list of documents that are to be submitted by a bidder in Section “F” of Contract Clause #9 – DBE Program. Therefore, please explain the purpose of Appendix A3, when this form is to be submitted by a bidders, and why this form would need to be submitted by a bidder.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 25, Paragraph J.</p>
3	<p>Please clarify the Description of work provided for Classified Bid Item #5 – Asphalt Concrete, PA-5. Is this the PA-5 Asphalt Mix with “Rosphalt 50” or no Rosphalt?</p>	<p>Bid as shown.</p>
4	<p>The Unit of Measure for Classified Bid Item #6 – Plant Mix Macadam is incorrectly stated as per Square Yard, and it should be paid Per Ton. Please correct this typographical error.</p>	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.</p>
5	<p>Please clarify the intention and scope of work for Classified Bid Item #8 – Off-Site Transportation and Disposal of Excavated Soil. In order to be consistent with the Soil Management and Disposal Notes on Dwg N101, please revise the description of work for Bid Item #8 to includes the words “Off-Site Transportation and Beneficial Re-use of Non-Hazardous, Contaminated Historic Fill”.</p>	<p>Bid as shown.</p>
6	<p>On Dwg N101, Soil Management and Disposal Note #4.1 states that the Historic Fill shall be beneficially reused at a facility located in New Jersey, which at face value appears to preclude the use of facilities that are not located in New Jersey. Since this is not consistent with past or current practice, please revise this note to remove the New Jersey facility requirement.</p>	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.</p>
7	<p>Since the Port Authority retains the right to approve or disapprove the Contractor’s proposed “disposal” facilities for the beneficial re-use of the Historic Fill that will be generated by this project, it would be extremely beneficial if bidders were provided with a list of Port Authority-approved “disposal” facilities that are acceptable to receive the Historic Fill for this project. Likewise, the bidders should be informed if there are any known “disposal” facilities that are not approved by the Port Authority for use on this project. Please provide this important information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Drawing N101, Note 4.2. Bid as shown.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
8	Please clarify the intent of the Work Hours provided in Paragraph A.4 of Contract Clause #141, which provides for Weekend Work or Night Shifts (during the week) for certain stages of the project. Please clarify whether or not it is the Contractor's preference and choice to work these Work Hours.	Refer to Contract Book, Page 210, A. 4.).
9	Please revise and clarify the Work Hours that are provided in Paragraph A.4e of Contract Clause #141 because the stated Work Hours in Paragraph A.4e are identical to the Work Hours provided in Paragraph A.4b.	This was answered by Addendum No. 1 dated 10/16/18.
10	Note #2.01.A on Dwg C101 requires a Material Transfer Machine (MTM) to be used for the asphalt paving work for this project. However, the type of asphalt paving being performed on this project, which involves parking lots and an access road, is not conducive to the use of an MTM. Also, from a "rideability" standpoint, there is no need to use an MTM for the paving work being performed for this project. Therefore, we request that Note #2.01.A be deleted from Dwg C101, or the Note should be revised to allow for the MTM to be optional, as determined by the Contractor.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.
11	Please confirm that for the new electrical ductbank work all cables for the new ductbank will be furnished and installed by PSE&G after the new ductbank is complete.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.
12	On Dwg E113, please clarify the Contractor's scope of work with regard to the New 8-5" Conduit Ductbank that starts at MH#1 and runs for an unspecified length to the PSE&G Gas Facility. With regard to this drawing and to this scope of work please address the following missing information: a. The information on this drawing does not clearly show or define the length of this new ductbank. b. The drawing does not clearly define where this new ductbank terminates. c. The drawing does not clearly define where the PSE&G Gas Facility is located. d. The drawing does not clearly define how to terminate this new ductbank: stub-ups or tie-in to an existing manhole, for example. e. The drawing does not show the existing conditions in the area where this new ductbank terminates.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
13	<p>On Dwg E113, please clarify the Contractor's scope of work with regard to the New Conduit Ductbank that starts at MH#1 and runs for an unspecified length into the Vendor Parking Lot. With regard to this drawing and to this scope of work please address the following missing information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The information on this drawing does not define the number and size of the conduits in this new ductbank.b. The information on this drawing does not clearly define the length of this new ductbank.c. The drawing does not clearly define where this new ductbank terminates.d. The drawing does not clearly define how to terminate this ductbank: stub-ups or tie-in to an existing manhole, for example..e. The drawing does not show the existing conditions in the area where this new ductbank terminates.	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.</p>
14	<p>Please review and revise the Work Hours and Staging information that is currently provided on the MT Drawings and in Section 141 of the Contract Booklet to clarify the Staging and the Work Hours that apply to the work that is to be performed along the East Access Road involving pavement removal, track removal, ductbank construction, and pavement reconstruction, all of which is very disruptive work and complicated to perform and is subject to variable subsurface conditions and buried utility crossings that can create unexpected delays. This work cannot be performed in a piecemeal nature over short periods of time during short-term, discontinuous Weekend Outages, as currently specified in the bid documents. This work can only be performed during a long term road closure lasting several weeks that provides the Contractor with continuous, uninterrupted access to this work area. Yet, this important information is not properly addressed in the bid documents. Also, the MT Drawings do not show Work Areas 9A & 9B, as mentioned in Section 141 of the Contract Booklet. The MT Drawings only show a single Work Area 9. Please clarify these important constructability issues as soon as possible.</p>	<p>This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
15	The allowable hours of work stated for the individual work areas in the Maintenance of Traffic plans (MT111 – MT123), do not match the allowable hours stated in Division 1 General Provisions, Section 141.A.(4). Specifically, there are conflicts in allowable work times for Areas 3A & 3B, 6, 7A & 7B, 8, and 10. Please confirm which areas are required to be completed during “Weekend Work Hours” only and which areas can be done during week day nights.	This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
16	The Sequence of Work provided in Division 1 General Provisions, Section 141.B.(15) lists Area 10 twice and does not list Areas 2A and 4A. Please confirm the grade crossings in Areas 2A and 4A are to replace the second Area 10 and be the final work completed.	This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
17	Contract Drawing E119 provides a profile of a 2-5” conduit duct bank from MH#6 to MH#1. Contract Plan E113 does not show a MH#6 nor this run. Please clarify. Also, the Analysis of Bid sheet provided for the Unclassified Work contains a Line Item for “Duct Bank 2-5” Conduits...”. Does this Line Item get eliminated if indeed it is determined there is no run/MH#6?	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.
18	In the Schedule of Unit Prices for Classified Work, the descriptions for Items No. 6 & 7 read “per Ton”, however the estimated quantities are in SY and CY respectively. Please confirm how Classified Work Items #6 & #7 are to be measured and paid.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-7-18 This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
19	The removal plans, Drawings C113 through C115, show full depth pavement removal for the entire width of East Access Road. In addition, the pavement plans, drawings C123 through C125, indicate a new full depth pavement section for the entire width of East Access Road. Please confirm the entire width of East Access Road will be reconstructed using the full depth pavement section shown on Sheet C201, Detail D3.	Refer to C201, Detail 3. 11-20-18 Revised Response - This will be answered by Addendum. 12-3-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.
20	Drawing C113 refers the contractor to reference document PAT-150 140A Drawing C91 for the details in regards to removing and disposing the abandoned Track. Drawing C-91 shows a 25" deep section for the Existing Track (6" Asphalt, 7" Timber Tie, 6" Ballast, & 6" DGA). Please indicate the required depth of removal for the abandoned Track in the East Access Road. Is it sufficient to remove to the bottom of Timber Tie (13 inches)?	Refer to C201, Detail 3, C202, Detail 7 and E116 through E120.
21	Profile E3 shown on drawing E119 shows 2-5" Conduits from MH #6 to MH #1. The plan drawings do not show MH #6 or the 2-5" Conduit duct bank. Please indicate where MH #6 and the 2-5" Conduit duct bank is located.	This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.
22	Drawing E113 does not indicate the length of the 8-5" Conduit duct bank between MH #1 and the PSE&G Gas Facility. Please provide the length of duct bank required from MH#1 to the PSE&G Facility.	This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18.
23	On 10/19/18 we submitted several important questions regarding the Staging, Work Hours and Constructability issues pertaining to the Pavement Removal, Track Removal and Duct Bank Work along the East Access Road. We are concerned that these questions have not yet appeared in the Q&A log, and these issues were not addressed in the recently received Addendum #2. We wish to confirm that these important issues are being addressed because the referenced work cannot be constructed as shown on the current set of drawings.	This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
24	<p>Please be advised that the 15% DBE Participation Goal for this project is unachievable for the following reasons: (a) the project offers very limited DBE subcontracting opportunities because the scope of work is very limited; (b) a major cost for this project involves the furnishing of hot mix asphalt, and yet there are no known asphalt plants that are owned and operated by DBE companies; (b) the other major component of the project is the construction of the PSEG Ductbank, and yet there are no known DBE companies who are approved by PSEG to perform this work; and, (c) we do not expect any DBE Participation from Track Work Subcontractors based on past experience. Therefore, based on our preliminary analysis, we request that the DBE Project Percentage Goal be lowered to a maximum of 3%.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 24, I 3.).</p>
25	<p>Please note that the new issued 11-05-18 Q&A Log #2 includes the same Q&A twice in Q&A #12 & Q&A #13. We speculate that Q&A #13 was intended to provide the PA response to the Work Hours and Staging Questions that we submitted on 10-16-18 regarding the Track Removal, Duct Bank Work, and Road Reconstruction Work that is to be performed along the East Access Road, and which has not been published yet in the Q&A Log, and was not addressed in Addendum #2. Please clarify.</p>	<p>This was answered by Addendum No. 2 dated 11/1/18. Refer to E113 and E119.</p>
26	<p>Please note that the Night Shift Work Hours stated in Note #2.03 on Dwg MT101 do not match the work hours stipulated in Part A.4 of Clause 141 on page 210 of the Contract Booklet. Dwg MT101 states that the Night Shift will end at 6 AM and Clause 141 states that the night shifts will end at 5 AM. Please clarify which time is correct.</p>	<p>This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.</p>
27	<p>We request that the Weekend Work Hours be extended as long as possible to allow for a longer work day on Sundays. Currently, the Sunday shift is stipulated to end at 2 pm on Sundays.</p>	<p>Bid as shown.</p>
28	<p>The bidders were provided with a PSEG General Specification No. 2016-5065 for Trench, Manhole, and Conduit Installation, which is referred to as the PAT-774.176 Reference Document. The bidders are told in Notes #1 & # 2 on the PSEG Ductbank Dwg's E113 to E115 to consult the PSEG Reference Document for details on the required Manholes and the Ductbank. However, the PSEG Reference document does not provide any Manhole Details and does not provide any Ductbank Details. Please provide this important missing information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
29	<p>Neither the PSEG Reference Document nor the Port Authority Bid Documents instruct the bidders on the type of materials to use for the construction of the PSEG Ductbank. The bidders need to know if all of the Ductbank conduits are to be Schedule 40 PVC, and if the Stub-up Risers are to be PVC or Rigid Galvanized Conduits, and if the PSEG Ductbank is to be encased in concrete, and if so, what dimensions and what concrete mix is to be provided, and the bidders need to be provided with a typical Ductbank Trench Detail that indicates whether or not the Ductbank requires any bedding material and the type of spacers and backfill that is to be provided, and the bidders need to know if the Electrical Manholes are to be made from Precast Concrete and not cast-in-place concrete. Please provide this important missing information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Bid as shown on reference drawings PSE&G Standard Manhole Detail and General Construction Standards Typical Conduit Trench Details.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
30	Note #12 on the PSEG Ductbank Dwg E101 states that the Contractor shall furnish and install all necessary materials for a complete ductbank system. However, the PSEG Reference Document (in Section #17 and Section #18) states that PSEG (the "Company") will furnish the Precast Manholes and the Conduit Materials, which is standard practice when contractors work directly for PSEG. Please clarify the conflicting information as soon as possible.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
31	We assume that the reference to I-22 in Note 3.02.N under General Notes for Field Ordered Work on Dwg G104 is actually referring to Soil Aggregate Type I-12 in the Earthwork Specifications.	This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
32	The Landscape Architecture Notes on Dwg G104 refer to seeding areas shown on the Civil Drawings. However, we have also found what appears to be additional Seeding Areas shown on the Environmental Drawings, specifically along the alignment of the Silt Fence. In order to prevent a misinterpretation of the drawings, please revise the Landscape Architecture Notes to make reference to the additional Seeding Areas that are also shown on the Environmental Drawings.	This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
33	The Environmental Drawings do not provide a Typical Silt Fence Detail that shows the type of Silt Fence that is required, and this information needs to be included on the drawings so that the bidders understand what is to be provided. Also, the Typical Silt Fence Detail needs to show the minimum width of the Topsoiling and Seeding Work that is to be performed along the alignment of the Silt Fence, as shown on the Environmental Plan Drawings N111 to N115 since that is not a typical detail and does not conform to standard practice. Please add the Typical Silt Fence & Topsoil and Seeding Detail to the Environmental Drawings.	Refer to N111 through N115. Also refer to G104, Notes 6.02 and 6.03. This was also answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
34	Please add notes on the drawings that indicate the locations where there is expected to be an energized third rail near the areas where the work will be performed near the tracks. This is important safety information that needs to be shown on the drawings and identified in the General Notes.	Refer to G104, Notes entitled "WORK NEAR TRACKS" and C141 through C151.
35	Please clarify if and when any of the tracks will be taken out of service and the third rail de-energized when work is being performed near the tracks.	Refer to G104, Notes entitled "WORK NEAR TRACKS".

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
36	<p>General Note #2.03 on Dwg G104 states that the Temporary Safety Fence is to be installed a minimum of 9 Feet from the centerline of the track as directed by the Resident Engineer. Since the determination for the placement of the Temporary Safety Fence will not be made until after the start of construction, this "IF and Where Directed" type of work should be included in the Field Ordered Work under General Note 3.02 on Dwg G104. Please revise Dwg G104 to include the Temporary Safety Fence under the General Notes for Field Ordered Work.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".</p>
37	<p>There are no General Notes on Dwg G104, or anywhere else on the drawings, that address the need to provide Temporary Shoring for the excavation of the new PSEG Ductbank, and how the Shoring is to be designed. Please provide this important information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".</p>
38	<p>Please clarify where Temporary Shoring is expected, required or anticipated when excavating for the new PSEG Ductbank. The Ductbank drawings do not indicate the locations where the Temporary Shoring is needed to support existing facilities, such as the tracks. Since the Ductbank drawings do not show any existing features that need to be temporarily shored, the bidders are unlikely to include any costs for Temporary Shoring in their bid proposals. Therefore, please clarify the locations where Temporary Shoring is expected, required, or anticipated.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".</p>
39	<p>Ductbank Dwg E113 does not show any of the existing tracks that are near the alignment of the new PSEG Ductbank. Yet, all of the other ductbank drawings show the locations of the existing tracks. Without the existing track information being shown on Dwg E113, the bidders are denied important information that will affect the pricing that they submit for this project. Please revise Dwg E113 and provide this missing information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
40	<p>The Removal Plan Dwg C113 shows important information that should be shown on Dwg E113. There is a Note near the intersection of Cape May Street that points to a section of the new PSEG Ductbank and states "Excavate Trench for Duct Bank Installation". This Note points to a section of the new PSEG Ductbank that appears to be immediately adjacent or very close to an operating track for approximately 250 Lineal Feet. Based on the information provided on Dwg C113 this section of the new PSEG Ductbank appears to be a candidate for Temporary Shoring, yet none of the drawings specify the need for Temporary Shoring to be provided at this location or anywhere else. Please clarify the Temporary Shoring requirements at this location and at all other locations that are expected, anticipated, or required as soon as possible</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".</p>
41	<p>Please confirm that the section of track, that is mentioned in the previous question, will be taken out of service, and that the third rail will be de-energized during the construction of the new PSEG Ductbank along that location.</p>	<p>Refer to G104, Notes entitled "WORK NEAR TRACKS" and Contract Book, Page 210, A. 4.).</p>
42	<p>Please provide a Typical Ductbank Trench Excavation and Shoring Detail that indicates the distance from the Ductbank Trench to the edge of the railroad tie, or to the centerline of the track, that will trigger the need for Temporary Shoring to be provided during the excavation for the new PSEG Ductbank. This detail needs to show the angle of the live load line of influence from the track and the intersection of the live load line of influence with the typical PSEG Ductbank Trench. This type of detail is standard information provided by all railroads when trenching near their tracks. Please provide this important missing information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Bid as shown on reference drawings PSE&G Standard Manhole Detail and General Construction Standards Typical Conduit Tranch Details. Also, refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".</p>
43	<p>Please provide the Railroad Loading Requirements for the design of the Temporary Shoring, which is typically Cooper E-80 Loading for most railroad work.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES". 11-27-18 Revised Response - Refer to S101, Structural Notes - 1 Design Criteria. Bid as shown.</p>
44	<p>Please add a new Bid Item for Temporary Shoring to the Unclassified Bid Item List.</p>	<p>Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
45	Will any Track Settlement Monitoring be required, and if so, then please provide the design parameters, specifications and scope of work for the Track Monitoring, and also add a Bid Item for this work to the Unclassified Bid Items.	Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".
46	The Typical X-Sections on Dwg C201 imply that the Milling and Paving program for this project is intended to Mill 3" or 4", depending on the location, and place 3" or 4" of Surface Course. However, the Grading Plans appear tell a different story. Please clarify the intent of the Mill & Pave Program for this project. Is the Contractor just removing 3" or 4" and replacing that depth with 3" or 4" of Surface Course; or, is the Contractor required to As-Built the existing pavement grades and establish a Grading Plan that will may require Variable Thicknesses of Milling and the installation of a Variable Thickness Surface Course to meet the Proposed Grades shown the Grading Plans?	Refer to C201, Detail 5, Notes 1 and 2.
47	Many of the existing topographic lines on the Grading Plan Dwg's do not show the existing elevations; or, if the elevations are provided, the elevations cannot be easily read unless the drawings are magnified more than 200%. For example, this deficiency is most evident on Dwg C131 and C132 and also occurs along the East Access Road on Dwg C133. Without this important existing information properly shown on the Grading Plans, the Grading Plans cannot be properly interpreted by the bidders, and the drawings cannot be used for construction purposes. Please provide this important missing information as soon as possible.	Refer to C201, Detail 5, Notes 1 and 2.
48	In regards to Classified bid Item # 6 "Plant mix Macadam", On page 371 under "Asphalt Concrete Mix Design" subheading #3 Plant Mix macadam base course mix (MIX I-1) shall be a mixture designed within the gradation limits specified in 2.03A. When we go to page 393, and review the table mentioned under 2.03 Mix tables there is no reference to Mix I-1 only I-2A. Please clarify which mix is to be used for classified Item # 6 Plant mix Macadam.	Refer to 1.03 B, last sentence. 11-16-18 Revised Response - Refer to Contract Book, Page 371, 1.03 B. 3., last sentence.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
49	In regards to the Rail Gauge to be installed and referencing sheet #S201 detail D/2 "5 ½" Wide Enclosed Gauge Insert Assembly", can you please confirm there is NO third rail (Electrified) at these locations. Also please confirm the width of the newly installed Track Gauge from the details provided on these plan sheets to the vendor listed in Note #2 details for this gauge which is listed as Model # ILF7841. Also does the Port Authority have as built drawings and or details for these specific areas. The referenced drawings provided do not match up to these specific areas to which this work is to be performed	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
50	Please clarify the tie spacing for the new crossing track. The rubber panel manufacturer is recommending 18" as opposed to 24" spacing shown on Contract Drawing C203.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
51	Please confirm the type of joint required within the grade crossings and also how the crossing is to be tied into the existing track (field welds or joint bars).	Refer to C203, Note 3 and Contract Book, Page 541, 3.03 F.5.
52	Drawing C151 shows a detail of the crossings and there is a note that says to replace a min of 10' of track on each end of each crossing. It appears that at one crossing there is a turnout within a few feet of the end of the crossing. Please clarify the intended scope of work at this location.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
53	Please advise if there is electricity going through the rail in the approach slabs at the HCMF Building.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
54	Please confirm the width of the concrete removal shown on Drawing S201 is adequate to accept the Gauge Insert. The manufacturer is suggesting a larger area is needed to install the track gauge.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
55	All 4 of the crossings in the Delivery Access Road have restraining rail and/or a metal flangeway. Please confirm that this restraining rail/metal flangeway does not get reinstalled and that new restraining rail/metal flangeway is not required. If they are required, the rubber panels shown will need to be modified.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
56	It appears that the rail joints off the road crossings are joined with bonded insulated joints. Is the intent to join the new rail to the old rail at these insulated joint locations despite the drawings indicating a minimum 10-foot replacement? Are new insulated joints required? If so, please provide a specification.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
57	Please clarify the scope requirements at grade crossings that have an insulating joint at restraining rail.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
58	Please clarify the requirements at the grade crossings in which the contact rail is closer than 10' from the ends of the crossings.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
59	Please confirm the Commercial General Liability insurance procured by PATH and referenced in Article 62 .A. does not have an exclusion under the contractual coverage for the indemnification of a railroad for work within 50' of any railroad property.	Refer to Contract Book, Clause 62 on Pages 97 through 100, especially fifth full paragraph on Page 98 and fourth paragraph on Page 99.
60	Is the rubber gage insert conductive or nonconductive?	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
61	Are rails outside of the crossing to be welded in or do we use joint bars?	Refer to C203, Note 3 and Contract Book, Page 541, 3.03 F.5.
62	Do we have to replace the Insulated joint bars with new?	Refer to Contract Book, Page 519, 2.15. This will also be answered by addendum. 11-27-28 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
63	One crossing goes into a switch Can we stop the rail before switch?	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
64	On drawing S-201 the cut out for the new rubber gage insert is not big enough to fit in the insert?	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
65	The MPT Drawing for Stage #9, MT122, indicates that the roadway shall be opened by 6:00 AM Monday morning. According to the Hours of Work Specification, the weekend work hours are from 11 PM Friday until 2 PM Sunday. If the roadway does not have to be opened until 6 AM Monday, can the contractor work beyond 2PM Sunday?	Refer to Contract Book, Page 210, A. 4.). This was also answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
66	<p>Contract Clause 9, Section F and Contract Clause 2 Section I –M, requires all bidders to submit their complete DBE Utilization Plan and originally signed forms with their bids. Please reconsider this requirement, to accepting the DBE forms and documents to the usual 7 days after the bid, as it causes an unnecessary cumbersome burden to the bidders.</p> <p>The reasons this requirement causes such a burden are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pricing is not usually received until the night before or the day of a bid. There is not enough time to thoroughly vet a vendor and then fill out the DBE forms. b. The amount of resources and man-power need to make sure each vendor fills out the form properly is too great pre-bid. c. Due to the vetting process and limited resources, a portion of the DBE vendors just don't have time to fill these forms out and return them properly completed in such a short time frame. Again, please consider on changing this requirement to receiving the DBE documents to 7 days after the bid. 	Bid as shown.
67	<p>A 15% DBE goal for this project is exceptionally high, given the amount of DBE vendors that perform the type of work required on this project. What methodology did the PANYNJ use to calculate a participation goal on such a small project as this? Is there any way this goal can be reduced to a more reasonable percentage?</p>	Refer to Contract Book, Page 17 (last sentence) and Page 24. Bid as shown.
68	<p>Is the cost for the PSE&G Overhead Lines shown on plan sheet E115 to be included under this contract?</p>	Refer to E101. Bid as shown.
69	<p>4) Several of the proposed rubber crossings appear to be in curves and contain guard rail, both of which can dramatically affect the cost of the crossing. To obtain a better understanding of the scope, please provide the following information for each of the five (5) proposed full depth crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing rail section b. Proposed rail section c. Location of compromise joints (if required) d. Degree of Curve e. Limits of Guard Rail within crossings f. If different rail sections, how to address compromise & associated guard rail. 	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
70	Plan sheet C151, note 1 indicates that there are additional grade crossing details on plan sheet C204. However, plan sheet C204 is not included in the project documents. Please provide.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
71	Plan sheet E114 shows a run of 8-5" duct bank. There is no item for 8-5" duct bank in the analysis of bid. Please clarify.	No change to Contract Documents. Bid as shown.
72	Please clarify why the I-12 Backfill requirements in the Earthwork Section 312388 do not provide for the use of Modified I-12 Backfill Gradations and other requirements for Modified I-12 Backfill, which are typically provided for other Port Authority projects.	Bid as shown.
73	Please clarify what safety measures will be employed by PATH operations personnel when Temporary Shoring is required to be installed by the Contractor adjacent, or within close proximity, to the Tracks and the Third Rail. For example: will the Third Rail be de-energized by PATH?	This was answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
74	When the Contractor is required to provide Temporary Shoring near the Tracks and the Third Rail, please confirm that Temporary Shoring materials can be made from steel, which conducts electrical currents.	Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".
75	Please clarify if there is a minimum clearance distance from the Third Rail that will be required for the installation of Temporary Shoring when trenching near or adjacent to the Tracks.	Refer to Contract Book, Page 166, Clause entitled "TEMPORARY STRUCTURES".
76	The detail for the 2 x 5" Ductbank shows compacted sand or granular fill placed around the conduits. However, the detail for the 6 x 5" Ductbank shows 1,500 PSI Concrete Encasement around those conduits. Please clarify whether or not the new PSEG Ductbanks for this project are to be encased in sand or 1,500 PSI Concrete.	Refer to Reference Drawing entitled "GENERAL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS TYPICAL CONDUIT TRENCH DETAILS". Bid as shown.
77	The detail for the 2 x 5" Ductbank calls out the conduits to be made from Schedule 40 PVC. However, the other details for the 4 x 5", the 6 x 5" and the 8 x 5" Ductbanks do not specify the type of materials to use for those conduits. Please clarify whether or not Schedule 40 PVC Conduits are to be used for the construction of all new PSEG Ductbanks on this project.	Refer to Reference Drawing entitled "GENERAL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS TYPICAL CONDUIT TRENCH DETAILS". Bid as shown.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
78	Note #2 on the Typical PSEG Ductbank Reference Drawing describes the type of backfill to use as “free of large stones, frozen material, cinders, ashes or as otherwise required”. However, the type of backfill material described in this Backfill Note does not conform to the Backfill requirements in the Earthwork Specification Section 312388. Please clarify the type of Backfill material that is to be used for the backfilling of the new PSEG Ductbanks for this project.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
79	Please confirm when the PSEG Ductbank work can be completed. Plan sheet MT 101, note 2.03 indicates that all work shall be performed Monday – Friday 3pm-6am (15 hours each night) or 11pm Friday – 2pm Sunday. Special Provision Clause 141, 3 indicates that this ductbank work can only be performed during Weekend hours.	Refer to Contract Book, Page 210, A. 4.). This was also answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
80	Please confirm the weekend work hours for Areas 1 – 10. Plan sheet MT101 note 2.03 indicates that weekend work shall be performed 11pm Friday – 2 pm Sunday. However, Plan Sheets MT111 – MT123 has notes indicating that the lot must be reopened by Monday at 6am, giving an additional 14 hours to the weekend.	Refer to Contract Book, Page 210, A. 4.). This was also answered by Addendum No. 3 dated 11/9/18.
81	Please confirm our interpretation of Classified Bid Item #8 that this Item is intended to compensate the Contractor for the off-site disposal/beneficial re-use of excavated Soil, excavated DGABC, excavated Ballast and excavated Sub-ballast, all of which are potentially contaminated materials that would be classified as ID-27 Materials. Please revise the eighth paragraph on page 58 of the Contract Booklet by inserting all of the above referenced excavated materials in the 2nd line of the eighth paragraph	Refer to N101, Note 4.1.
82	Because the Removal Plans do not provide different symbols for 3” deep Milling versus 4” deep Milling, it is not always clear as to which paved areas are to be Milled 3” deep versus 4” deep. Therefore, please clarify whether or not the North and South Access Ways are to be Milled 3” deep or 4” deep. In other words, are these two paved areas considered Roads or Parking Areas?	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
83	If the North and South Access Ways are to be Milled 4” deep then the quantities for Classified Bid Items #1 & #2 are not correct. Please address and clarify.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
84	<p>Please clarify the method of measurement and payment for Classified Bid Items #4 & #5. If the intention is pay for these two Items as per the “gross” areas that are delineated with the cross-hatched symbol on the Removal Plans, then that is fine. However, if the intention is to deduct the areas occupied by the track removals along the East Access Road from Pay Item #4, then the Estimated Quantity for Bid Item #4 needs to be significantly reduced. And, if the intention is to deduct the areas occupied by the four Grade Crossings at Delivery Road from the area to be paid under Bid Item #3, then the Estimated Quantity for Pay item #3 needs to be greatly reduced. Please clarify the method of measurement and payment for these two Classified Bid Items by revising the third and fourth paragraphs on page 58 of the Contract Booklet, which currently do not address this important issue.</p>	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.</p>
85	<p>Reference drawing C203 – This drawings provides standard grade crossing details for the full depth rubber crossings, however, this detail does not represent actual field conditions. Please advise regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All four delivery drive grade crossings have a guardrail on one side and a steel angle flangeway on the opposite side. The West Parking Lot grade crossing has a guardrail only on one side. Please confirm that the guardrail system is to remain and the angle flangeway system is not required in the new installations. b. Please advise if the existing guardrail can be reinstalled or if the contractor is required to furnish new guardrail and separator blocks. c. If new guardrail is to be installed please provide current details and specifications. d. The rail is labeled as 115#RE on the drawing. All five existing grade crossings to receive full depth rubber are 100#RB. Please confirm if new rail is to be 100-8 or 115#RE with compromise joints to existing. 	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.</p>
86	<p>Regarding the southernmost grade crossing at the delivery drive – the stockrails of the switch fall within the 10’ limit beyond the end of the grade crossing. Please confirm the new rail is to meet the existing stockrail and no modifications are to be made to the switch stockrail.</p>	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.</p>
87	<p>There are single and double insulated joints outside the rubber crossing locations but within the 10’ limit of work on several of the grade crossings. Please confirm if the contractor is to furnish & install new insulated joints to match existing.</p>	<p>This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
88	There are signal wires connected to the rails within the 10' limit of work beyond the rubber crossing limit. Please advise if the contractor is to remove and reconnect the wires or if PATH Signal force account will perform this work.	This will be answered by addendum.
89	Reference drawing S201 – The removal and installation limits show saw cutting the slab 7" from rail centerline. The edge of the existing trough pocket is approx. 9½" from the rail centerline and the grout is deteriorated and broken out in many locations on all approaches. Please confirm that the grout should be removed and replaced on the gauge side of the rail to edge of the trough.	This will be answered by Addendum. 11-27-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 5 dated 11/26/18.
90	According to the notes and symbols on the Civil Drawings, the East Access Road is to be excavated full-depth, curb-to-curb, and then reconstructed with new full-depth pavement, curb-to-curb. However, this information conflicts with the notes and information presented in the Full-Depth Pavement Restoration Detail #D/3 on Dwg 201, which only shows full-depth pavement restoration within the limits of the new PSEG Ductbank Trench. This is a major inconsistency and conflict in the bid documents that needs to be corrected ASAP on the drawings as well as in quantities used on the Schedule of Unit Prices for Classified Work for Bid Items #1 through 7. The bidders needs to know if the information presented in Detail #D3 is correct or not. Please issue revised drawings and, or a revised Schedule of Classified Work as soon as possible to address this conflict.	Bid as shown. 11-28-18 Revised response - This will be answered by Addendum. 12-3-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.
91	Please provide curve data for the reinforced rubber crossings as the geometry of the track may require special manufacturing of the panels.	Bid as shown.

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
92	<p>Our interpretation of the Full-Depth Pavement Restoration Detail D/3 on Dwg C201 is that the Contractor is to restore the Ductbank Trench by placing 6" of DGABC and an 8" thick layer of PMM Base Course that will provide a temporary riding surface along the East Access Road until the Ductbank work is completed. After the Ductbank work is completed Detail D/3 indicates that the 8" thick layer of PMM Base Course is to be Milled to a depth of 4" along with a 12" wide section of adjacent undisturbed pavement on both sides of the Ductbank Trench. With regard to the work that we just described, please confirm the following:</p> <p>Please confirm our interpretation that the Contractor will be paid per Ton under Classified Bid Item #6 to place the full 8" of PMM Base Course shown in Detail D/3 on Dwg C201.</p> <p>Please confirm our interpretation that the Contractor will be paid per Square Yard under Classified Bid Item #2 for the 4" of Milling shown in Detail D/3 on Dwg C201 for the entire width of the restored Ductbank Trench plus the 12" wide sections of adjacent undisturbed pavement on both sides of the Ductbank Trench.</p>	<p>Bid as shown. 11-28-18 Revised response - This will be answered by Addendum. 12-3-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.</p>
93	<p>Unfortunately, the response to Question #19 does not provide the degree of clarification that fully addresses the root cause of the question. The Removal Plan Drawings and Paving Plan Drawings referenced in Question #19 show curb-to-curb, full-depth reconstruction of those roadway areas. However, Detail D/3 on Dwg C201 is a Ductbank Trench Restoration Detail that does not show curb-to-curb full-depth reconstruction of the roads. Therefore, either the limits shown on the Removal and Paving Plans are incorrect, or Detail D/3 is not correct. Please revise the drawings to correct this conflict.</p>	<p>Bid as shown. 11-28-18 Revised response - This will be answered by Addendum. 12-3-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
94	<p>If the intent is truly to perform the curb-to-curb full-depth reconstruction of the roadway areas shown on the Removal Plans and Paving Plans, then please clarify what is to happen with the existing Concrete Curbs along both sides of those roads since the full-depth removal work will likely undermine the existing concrete curbs, and the curbs will be lost. Please clarify the quantity of new concrete curbs that will need to be replaced and how the Contractor will be compensated for reconstructing the Concrete Curbs that will be lost when performing the curb-to-curb, full-depth pavement reconstruction work.</p>	<p>Bid as shown. 11-28-18 Revised response - This will be answered by Addendum. 12-3-18 This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.</p>
95	<p>Drawing C151, Note 2 and Drawing C203 Note 4 state to furnish new track material to the first joint beyond the crossing, while the "Plan View Detail" on Drawing C203 calls out "4 new ties beyond the edge of crossing.</p> <p>a. Please clarify the confusion. b. Please provide the location of these joints (limit of work) relative to the edge of crossing.</p>	<p>This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.</p>
96	<p>Drawing C151, Note 3 states to assume existing rail is 140 LB unless field verified. We do not believe that there is any such rail section used in the facility. The specifications and drawings mention 100RB and 115RE rail; 140 LB rail is not mentioned anywhere. If the existing rail is 100RB, the difference between 140 & 100 is too great to be addressed with one set of compromise joints; there must be a 19'6" stepdown rail placed between them, such as 115. If this is the situation, there is insufficient room for this too take place.</p> <p>a. Please provide the rail section to be used in the crossings. b. If 140 LB is the section required, please provide a detailed layout illustrating the limits of replacement for each rail section.</p>	<p>a. This will be answered by Addendum. b. This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.</p>

QUES	QUESTION	RESPONSE
97	<p>Regarding insulated joints, Drawing C203 Note 5 instruct the contractor to replace any existing insulated joints. Insulated joints are not shown on the plans and there are too many crossings and variables to place the risk of assuming the scope upon the contractor.</p> <p>a. Please provide the number and location of all insulated joints to be replaced.</p> <p>b. Please indicated if insulated joints are for double or single rails.</p> <p>c. Who is responsible for disconnecting and reconnecting any signal wires?</p>	<p>a. through c. This was addressed by Addendum No. 6 dated 12/3/18.</p>

