PORT AUTHORITY NY NJ
AIR LAND RAIL SEA

GATEWAY PROGRAM

BIDDERS QUESTION LOG

GDC23-002 – GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION – TONNELLE AVENUE OVERHEAD BRIDGE AND UTILITY RELOCATIONS

QUES#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
1	We would like to request access to inspect the site for Contract GCD23-002 Tonnelle Ave Overhead Bridge and Utility Relocation. We'd like to visit the job location, specifically the area that was previously built and is to be demolished per this contract. This visit would help us better understand the project and thus price the project accordingly.	A site visit is being scheduled. Please continue to monitor Bonfire for updates.
2	Is there a pre-bid meeting for this project? When is it.	See Addendum No. 2
3	Is the attached only for MWBE/SBE/SDVOB firms? I am trying to register for the event through the Webex link but the last question asks whether any of the certifications apply to us. They do not. There is no N/A option and the registration will not let me proceed until I choose a selection for "Check all certifications that apply".	Resolved.
4	Drawing C02-CT-2123 identifies stage 1 sheeting as installed in previous contract (per note 2), can drawings be provided showing, limits of installed sheeting, material used (type, thickness, etc..) and design details (calcs, etc)?	Sheeting is a matter of the contractor's means and methods and was not part of the design in the ARC project. No representations are made concerning any sheeting that might be remaiining.
5	On Drawing C02-CT-2102 note 4, reference is made to a remedial action work plan, this document was not included in bid package. Can this information be provided?	There is not a remedial action work plan and this drawing will be modified to remove the reference to one.
6	We have not been able to find geotechnical information in the data provided, this will be necessary for shoring design, utility installation and rock excavation.	See Addendum No. 1
7	Drawing C02-CT-2123 identifies Stage 1 sheeting has been installed in the previous contract (per note 2). The previous Contractor's design should have been submitted and approved prior to installation, and asbuilt records provided for the left-in-place elements. In the best interest of all parties involved with this current RFP, and to mitigate any future conflicts, please provide the previous Contractor's design submission showing the dimensions, type, thickness, and design calcs used under the prior contract for consideration, incorporation, and conformance into this Contract. The Authority's previous response does not take into account that this design was submitted for the record under the prior Contract.	See Addendum No.1.
8	Please identify the Railroad company that operates the tracks along the western border of the site located at 2001 Tonnelle Ave. a.Will the Contractor need to provide any Railroad Protective Liability insurance for working within 50ft of these tracks? b.If so, please identify the insurance requirements, number of trains per day, and speed of trains on this track system.	Conrail Shared Assets (New Jersey) operates the tracks adjacent to the western border of the site. The New York, Susquehanna and Western Railway operates the track west of the Conrail tracks.
9	The Contract requires the demolition and removal of the existing abutments and pier built in place under the previous ARC contract: a.Under what conditions would the Contractor be able to incorporate these existing foundation elements into the new permanent bridge structure? b.Can the Authority certify that these foundation elements have been built on suitable subgrade meeting the bearing pressures of the new design loading? c.Can the Authority certify that these foundation elements have been built to meet the pressures of the new design loading?	(a) If the Contractor were to submit a Value Engineering Change Proposal for the re-use of the existing substructure, the Contractor would have to demonstrate that the existing substructure is suitable for the Tonnelle Avenue Overhead Bridge. (b) No. (c) No.
10	Does the Contractor need any permissions to visit the project site on their own?	A site visit is being scheduled. Bidders are not permitted to visit private property areas of the site unescorted.
11	1.Within the Contract Information Summary, Item 9 – Contract Type, it list this Contract as a Design-Bid-Build. a.Please confirm that the design provided within the Contract drawings are 100% complete in their design of permanent elements. b.Please identify the elements to be constructed and/or scope of work for which the Contractor will be responsible for the completion of design under this contract.	The drawings are 100 percent complete in the design of permanent elements. The bidder is not expected to include cost for the completion of any of the design embodied in the drawings and specifications.
12	"Has the design of this project been approved by NJDOT for construction? a. Please elaborate on what permits will the Contractor be obligated to secure from the NJDOT? b. Have the construction drawings been approved by the NJDOT? c. Have the traffic control plans been approved by the NJDOT? d. Have the temporary signal documents and drawings been approved by the NJDOT? e. Have the drawings been approved by the appropriate Soil Conservation and DEP agencies? Please provide the associated permits."	This is not an NJDOT project and NJDOT will not own the new bridge. NJDOT has reviewed and commented on the drawings and specifications, and changes have been made to accommodate NJDOT's concerns that will appear in an Addendum. NJDOT approval is pending resolution of inserts for the temporary construction barrier, and a jurisdictional agreement between Amtrak and NJDOT. (a) The only permit that is needed from the NJDOT is a Highway Occupancy Permit that the EOR will obtain for the contractor. Therefore, the contractor should not be responsible for obtaining any permits from the NJDOT. (b) (c) (d) Refer to response for (a) (e) The plans have been reviewed by the permitting agencies and all necessary permits have been obtained. Copies of these permits were uploaded into the NJDOT's PMRS system. Concerning Contamination/HAZMAT, no NJDEP approvals are required.
13	Please direct us to or provide the geotechnical reports and soil boring logs associated with the required work under this Contract.	See Addendum No. 1
14	Pertaining to bid items 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, please provide the investigation reports and testing data to determine where and what types of contamination and/or hazardous materials we will be expected to encounter.	Investigation Reports, Testing Data and other contaminant information will be included with the Materials Management Plan (MMP) being prepared pursuant to NJDEP's Linear Construction Technical Guidance. *See Addendum No. 5
15	In consideration of the information to be provided by the Authority, the need for the Authority to conduct a site visit on private property, and that the bid date is only two weeks from the writing of this RFI, please consider postponing the bid date to two weeks after the Contractor's receipt of the requested information and the site visit.	See Addendum No. 4
16	With regards to maintenance and protection of traffic to be provided by the Contractor, a significant amount of lanes closures and flagging will be required throughout the duration of this project for operations to be performed by both the Contractor and third party utility companies not working as our subcontractors. Though the Contractor can calculate the needs for his own operations, we have no way of knowing the needs of the utility companies and the durations required. State roadways require uniformed traffic control officers to direct traffic, while flagmen are needed to spot the movement of construction equipment in and out of the workzones. Therefore, please address the following: a.Will each third party utility company be responsible for the cost of providing their own setup and removal of traffic control devices, performing lane closings, and providing police officers and flagmen? b.Please consider creating unit price bid items and quantities for both Traffic Control Lane Closures – Each, Uniform Traffic Control Police Officers – Manhours, and Flagmen – Manhours. c.In the event that the Authority will not consider the previous request, then kindly prescribe the number of lane closures, and the number of days we should carry in our Lump Sum pricing to level the pricing at time of bid, since we have no way to determine these costs to be performed by utility companies outside the Contractor's control. d.For scheduling purposes and associated cost of determining management and supervision, please provide the number of calendar days we should assume for each third party utility company to perform their respective scope.	Refer to the following from Specification Section 01 35 13.01, MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAY AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC: 1.08 SUBMITTALS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL A. The Contractor shall submit the following to the Commission Representative for review and approval within 30 days after the date of the NTP: 1. MPT Plans for all construction locations, developed in close consultation with Hudson County, NJ TRANSIT, NJDOT, and the Township of North Bergen, as applicable. The Commission Representative shall submit these MPT Plans to the cognizant agency or locality for approval. 3.03 PROTECTIVE AND WARNING DEVICES A. The Contractor shall erect or place, and maintain in good condition, appropriate and adequate barricades, signs, lights, beacons, flares, approved red flasher units, rubber cones, drums and other warning and danger signals and devices at working sites, closed roads, intersections, open excavations, locations of material storage, standing equipment and other obstructions; at points where the usable traffic width of the road is reduced; at points where traffic is deflected from its normal course of lanes; and at other places of danger to vehicular or pedestrian traffic or to completed work. Flagmen will be used as necessary. The various traffic control and warning devices shall be in accordance with Part VI of the MUTCD and approved by the Commission Representative.

18	In that there's no surcharge fill material on this project, and no geotechnical and/or monitoring instruments are identified to be installed on the plans, please remove 31 09 12- Geotechnical Instrumentation from the Technical Specifications to avoid any confusion.	*See Addendum No. 7
19	Considering a site visit is still to be held, please consider rescheduling both the current bid opening and the Bidders Question submission deadlines by at least 4 weeks.	See Addendum No. 4
20	It doesn't appear as though the cross-section account for the excavation needed to construct the footings, or the slabs between the footings. We cannot accurately bid this work as is shown due to the discrepancy between the cross sections and the structure plans. Please revise the cross-sections to show the required foundation and concrete slab excavation, and confirm that this excavation has been accounted for in the quantiles of Items 31.3 and 31.5 or adjust the quantities for these items if necessary.	See Addendum No. 4
21	Can you please provide details of the in-place concrete-encased ductbank between PSE&G manholes #26 & #28, such as height, width, and depth from top or roadway to top of the concrete-encased ductbank? Are any steel plates in place above the concrete-encased ductbanks?	See Addendum No. 4
22	Item Number 31.2 – Site Grading is a lump sum quantity, but the exact extent of this work is not made clear via the specs or drawings. Please elaborate as to what is to be included in this bid item that separates it from the quantified earthwork items?	Site grading is defined in Specification Section 31 11 00.
23	Information regarding the proposed work appears to be missing from several plan sheets (Ex. Drawing No. C02-CT-2141 and 2150). It looks like one or more layers is turned off. Please review and re-issue corrected plan sheets	Drawings will be re-issued in a future Addendum. *See Addendum No. 7
24	Please provide the stage 1 sheeting design calculations and drawings that were approved from the ARC project so we can develop an accurate cost to remove the sheeting. For example the section that was installed parallel to Rt 9 between the abutments has to be removed for final underpass configuration. We need the details of the sheeting from the ARC project to estimate this cost. Question #7 of the Q&A requests similar information as above and the response to this question suggests it was issued in Addendum No.1. Although as-builts were provided in Addendum 1, they do not provide any information as to what type of sheeting system has been installed, the limits of sheeting installed (and/or what portion if any was removed) and therefore we cannot develop an accurate cost to remove the sheeting.	See Addendum No. 1
25	Please clarify whether the sleeves in the abutment backwalls for electrical conduit are to be steel as shown on Plan Page 125 or if they're to be PVC as shown on Plan Page 128.	PVC, per current PSE&G standard. *See Addendum No. 4
26	Appropriate callouts will be added: The 3.5' thickness of Class B concrete fill between substructure footings is non-reinforced concrete fill with the limits matching the full length of abutment; and a step detail as shown in Section M on DWG. No. ST-2520 shall be also provided for this Class B concrete fill.	Appropriate callouts will be added: The 3.5' thickness of Class B concrete fill between substructure footings is non-reinforced concrete fill with the limits matching the full length of abutment; and a step detail as shown in Section M on DWG. No. ST-2520 shall be also provided for this Class B concrete fill.
27	"Regarding the underground electrical relocations as shown on plan sheets 50 and 51 please the clarify the following. a) Is the existing ductbank on the western portion of the proposed bridge concrete encased full length from MH#26 to MH#28 or is it only encased for the length of the proposed bridge? b) Does the ductbank between MH#26 and MH#28 currently have cables within the conduits "	(a) Concrete encasement does not go under the bridge deck. (b) We have no information about southbound Tonnelle Avenue.
28	The retaining wall working points (WP7, WP8 AND WP9) as shown on plan sheet 145 do not match the wall working points shown on plan sheet 23. Please revise.	Drawing will be updated with WP8, WP9, WP10. *See Addendum No. 7
29	Sheet 25 (Drawings C02-CT-2150) has arrows calling out striping that is not shown. Is the proposed striping intentionally not shown or is there an error on this drawing?	*See Addendum No. 7
30	It is unclear who is reponsible for the constructing the PSE&G UG (12)5" concrete-encased ductbank from PSE&G MH #26 to the South Abutment backwall and from PSE&G MH #28 to the North Abutment backwall once the bridge-mounted (12)5" FRE conduits are in-place. Will it be the Contractor's hired pre-qualified PSE&G Subcontractor, or will it be PSE&G itself? Can you please provide the details for this new section of concrete-encased ductbank?	The Contractor's subcontractor, pre-approved by PSE&G, will construct the duct bank. Refer to Specification Section 33 71 19.
31	Can you please provide the size and type of pipe shown on plan Page C02-CT-2142 (pg 23 of plans) at "Access Road" station 10+90?	The pipe is 12" RCP. A callout has been added to CT-2142 and a new profile has been added to CT-2143. These drawings will be re-issued in an Addendum. *See Addendum No. 7
32	Note 3 on plan sheet 19 of 158 states to hand dig within 3' of anticipated footing location. This note is not referenced anywhere on this plan sheet as being applicable. Please clarify the intent of this note and where it applies to the footings? Moreover, the plan sheet shows the proposed bridge footing within rock so confirm the intent is not to hand dig rock.	Note 3 is to be deleted. Existing/anticipated footing is to be demolished.
33	Plan Sheet 16 shows the bidder to "Remove Underground Septic Tank", and "Remove Suspected Tank near Pipe Penetrations". Please provide as-built details of these features so the bidders can accurately price this work. If as-builts are not available, please add an Allowance Item to cover this work, or clarify that this work will be paid as Compensation for Extra Work.	As-builts are not available. Refer to Note 4 on this drawing, which will be re-issued in an Addendum to remove reference to a Remedial Action Work Plan. This is demolition work as defined in Specification Section 02 41 00, and payment will be as defined therein.
34	Plan Sheet 16 shows the bidder to "Remove 24" thick reinforced concrete slab and any supporting structures". Please provide as-built details of this structure so the bidders can accurately price this work. Bidders have no way to price the removal of "any supporting structures". If as-builts are not available, please add an Allowance Item to cover this work, or clarify that this work will be paid as Compensation for Extra Work.	As-builts are not available. Refer to Note 4 on this drawing, which will be re-issued in an Addendum to remove reference to a Remedial Action Work Plan. This is demolition work as defined in Specification Section 02 41 00, and payment will be as defined therein.
35	Note 2 on Plan Sheet 19 states the Stage 1 Temporary Excavation Support from the ARC project is still in place, and contractor may extend and reuse this support for this project. Please confirm this means The Partnership has reviewed the design of this existing Stage 1 Temporary Excavation Support and confirms it is adequate for this project and we only need to extend it as required. If The Partnership has not certified the existing temporary excavation support in Stage 1 can be reused for this project, we need to know details of what was left in the ground and exact location. If the existing temporary excavation support has tie back anchors we will not be able to install new sheeting behind the existing, or easily remove the existing sheeting. Therefore, the new support system would have to go in front of the existing. Please confirm the footing and abutment designs have been modified from the ARC project to provide clearance for new sheeting to be installed in front of the existing sheeting, as there appears to be limited clear room between the footing work and existing temporary excavation support sheeting.	Note 2 on Plan Sheet 19 does not state that the existing sheeting is "adequate for this project." As stated in Note 2, Contractor may extend and re-use existing support if possible." The Engineer of Record makes no representations of the adequacy or suitability of existing sheeting.
36	Note 4 on Plan Sheet 19 states the Permanent Excavation Support shall be constructed to top of rock. Sections CT-1 and CT-2 on the same plan sheet appear to show some of that excavation support going into the existing rock. Please revise the elevation sections CT-1 and CT-2 accordingly. Also, please clarify what circumstance/design loads the 41' and 55' long sections of Permanent Excavation support should be designed for? Are they just designed for the excavation to the grades/limits included in this contract as shown on Plan Sheet 22, or is there future work in this area they need to be designed for?	The excavation support shown going into existing rock is only as needed for the construction of the abutment for the utility support structure. The Permanent Excavation Support is to be designed for the future open cut excavation to El. 314.
37	Please confirm there are no mass concrete requirements for any of the concrete structures.	There are no mass concrete requirements.
38	Please clarify measurement & payment limits for Item No 32.2- Concrete Barrier Curb. Is this just supposed to be for the median barrier on the bridge structure, or does it include the portion on the approach slab, or the roadway portion? Please clearly identity the limits that are measured and paid under Item No 32.2 versus the limits that are to be included in one of the Lump Sum items.	The quantity for median barrier curb beyond concrete approach slabs should be 781 LF (end to end) - 145 LF (on bridge deck and approach slabs) = 636 LF.
39	The storm drainage run near Sta 1+00 as shown on Plan Sheet 23 does not call out pipe type/size or outlet and inlet structures. Please provide this information.	The pipe is 12" RCP. A callout has been added to CT-2142 and a new profile has been added to CT-2143. These drawings will be re-issued in an addendum. *See Addendum No. 7
40	Various reinforcement steel bars shown in the bar lists on Plan Sheets 143 & 144 are denoted as "Horizontal Temp. Reinforcement" (see Note 1 on pages 143 and 143). Please clarify what is meant by "Temp. Reinforcement"	Temp. (Temperature) Reinforcement was noted to distinguish from main reinforcement. Only used for notation, no material differences from other bars. The note will be updated for clarification in the drawings. *See Addendum No. 7
41	There are multiple instances in the bar lists on Plan Sheets 140-144 where the bar mark size does not match the bar size shown in column 2 of the bar lists. For example on Plan Sheet 144, bar mark 19SA01T should be a #19 bar however it is listed as a #16 bar. Please correct the inconsistencies.	Bar Sizes indicated by Bar Marks are correct. Column 2 will be updated to match bar mark sizes.
42	"The Structural drawings clearly identify Construction Stages 1, 2A, 2B, and 3. The Roadway/Civil drawings do not match that staging and generally only show Stages 1, 2 and 3. We believe Stage 3 roadway drawings would basically have an ""early Stage 3"" which would be equivalent to Stage 2B and a ""later Stage 3"" which would match Stage 3 on the Structural drawings we. Please confirm and correct Roadway/Civil drawings if needed. "	MPT for staging on civil drawings is focused on traffic control and safety.. The contractor has the freedom to decide what to do in the available construction area, especially for structures that are staged according to structure excavation, component cast or assembly, and joint locations. Therefore the staging in the Civil/MPT drawiings, and the staging in the Structural drawiings, are not identical.
43	Plan Sheet 19 shows the locations and limits of the needed Temporary & Permanent Excavation Support. We believe this plan sheet is missing the Temporary Excavation Support needed to build the concrete abutments in Stage 2B as per the Structural drawings. These abutments are required for the utility support and must be built prior to the Stage 3 work. Therefore, Temporary Excavation Support is need to isolate the abutment excavation, and support the existing soil/utilities until they are moved onto the utility structure. Please correct Plan Sheet 19 accordingly.	Temporary Excavation Support shown is suggested and dependent on the Contractor's means and methods. The Permanent Excavation Support is required as shown.

44	The bid documents and the as-builts and geotechnical information provided with Addendum 1 do not include any information regarding the various fill/embankment materials that were used in the ARC project to backfill the Stage 1 construction and to build the embankment slope. Please provide the approved analytical information for the materials that were used to fill the Stage 1 ARC project and build the embankment. Also, in that the bid document do not provide an Earthwork Summary that the bidders can use to correlate to the quantities of Items 31.3 to 31.5 please confirm that if the existing on-site material is determined to be unsuitable for whatever reason (unsound geotechnically and/or environmentally) for re-use on this project, then the contractor will be paid for imported fill/embankment material under Item No. 31.4 Embankment.	Refer to Specification Section 31 23 50.
45	After seeing the site, there are several busses adjacent to the site. Please clarify the number of busses that the contractor will be required to dispose of.	There are 7 buses to be disposed of.
46	Section 31 09 13 of the specifications describes monitoring of existing and new geotechnical devices. 1. Please identify on the plans the locations of all devices that fall under this Section. 2. Please provide details of all new devices to be constructed.	*See Addendum No. 7
47	Please confirm the material generated by item 31.5 Rock Excavation: 1. will be disposed of off-site. 2. Disposal will be paid under either items 2.1, 2.2 or 2.2 .	All disposal will be off-site. The corresponding pay items are 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 as appropriate.
48	As-Built Plan Sheet 21 of 195 that was provided with Addendum 1 appears to show an existing 12" storm drain and manhole near the south abutment that was abandoned and left in place. Did the storm drain and manhole actually get built, and if so, what depth are they and do they need to be removed?	Assume that the as-builts show what was built. The EOR has no additional information.
49	Is the excavation for the bridge foundations paid under bid item 31.3 and included in the pay quantity? If not, please clarify where the foundation excavation is paid under.	*No. The foundation excavation shall be included in Bid Item 3.5
50	Reference is made to Attachment A Bid Form. Item No. 1.0, 1.2 and 1.3 are fixed bid price "Allowance" items. Please confirm that the Contractor will be reimbursed their actual costs plus allowance markups under these bid items. The referenced specifications do not indicate this.	Contractor will be compensated either negotiated lump sum or cost reimbursement and a fair and reasonable overhead and profit markup.
51	Reference is made to the Information for Bidders regarding the relationship between the Port Authority and the Gateway Development Commission. Please indicate if the Gateway Development Commission will have a separate form of contract other than the Port Authority contract included in the bid documents.	The Bid Documents reflect the contractual requirements.
52	We hereby request a two week extension to the current bid date.	See Addendum No.4
53	Do you know what steel sheet piling was left in place under the original contract for Stage 1 ?	See Addendum No.1
54	Since the original contractor knows what was built already (under the Arc contract) stage 1 section of the bridge. Other contractors bidding this project that would have to demo and rebuild the section previously contracted and the original contractor may not have to.	The existing abutment walls, prior to demolition of the deck work, removal of the beams, and prior to being covered, were built in accordance with the contract plans and specifications. Addendum #1 contains the As-Built drawings for the original contract. Any contractor that chooses to explore the concept of keeping the original abutment walls, as a value engineering submission, will be required to go through the testing and approval process to confirm the usability and integrity of the walls. In addition, any contractor will be required to maintain the existing project timeline and gain approval by the NJDOT.
55	Is the excavation for the bridge foundations paid under bid item 31.3 and included in the pay quantity? If not, please clarify where the foundation excavation is paid under.	Yes
56	The Demolition Plan on sheet 16 says that the reinforced concrete pad to be removed is 24" thick. At the site visit on 3/2/23, it was mentioned that in some areas the concrete pad can be 3' thick. These areas are not indicated anywhere in the plans. If there are 3' thick areas, please call them out in the plans.	The reinforced concrete pad is a minimum of 24 inches thick. In some places it may be up to 36 inches thick. The EOR does not have the locations of extra thickness.
57	Plan Sheet 83 shows removal of various Temporary Traffic Signal Items, including the 10' deep STF Foundations and 3" conduit that crosses Tonnelle Ave. Please confirm that the 3" RMC can be abandoned in place, and the STF foundation only needs to be removed to 3' below finish grade, and if so, revise the plan sheets accordingly to note the removal/abandonment limits.	The conduit can be abandoned per NJDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction 201.03.01 D. The foundation should be removed to a minimum depth of 2 feet below the finished grade per NJDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction 201.03.01 G.
58	Addendum 3 identified an area that will be off-limits due to activity by Amtrak's contractor. In that the identified area directly impacts contract work proposed under contract GDC23-002, please provide the anticipated timeframe that the bidders should assume this area will be unavailable due to the Amtrak contractor's activity, and the anticipated completion date so that the bidders can evaluate the potential impacts.	This area will be available to the Contractor no larer than February 2025, and will be made available sooner if possible.
59	At the pre bid meeting it was mentioned the existing building slab on the west side could be up to 3' thick, the plans call for 2' thick. Please confirm if 2 or 3' thick.	The reinforced concrete pad is a minimum of 24 inches thick. In some places it may be up to 36 inches thick. The EOR does not have the locations of extra thickness.
60	Page C02-CX-2509 (pg 73 of plans) shows "Existing Manhole & 12 inch Pipe at STA. 4667+64.0". Is this MH#2 as shown on page C02-CT-2141 (pg 22 of plans)? If so, can you confirm if this manhole is already existing and fully in place for future use, or whether it will need to be replaced by this contract? Otherwise, is this an existing manhole that will need to be removed?	MH #2 and 12" pipe do exist and were abandoned under the ARC Project when it was canceled. The existing manhole and pipes shall be demolished and constructed anew as shown on drawing C02-CT-2141.
61	Please confirm that any Rock Excavation performed throughout the contract, including all underground utility work, will be paid under Item #31.5 "Rock Excavation (31 23 50)".	Confirmed
62	Plan sheet 82 indicates a standard STF foundation for a 65' steel mast arm. Please confirm this is correct.	Confirmed
63	Plan sheets 102 and 133 indicate the northwest wingwall to be built flush against the existing retaining wall (without any removal of the existing wall). The vertical distance from the bottom of this new wingwall footing to the existing bottom of retaining wall is about 16'. Please confirm: 1. the existing retaining wall does not require demolition and reconstruction. 2. please confirm the existing retaining wall does not need underpinning, etc.	The existing retaining wall does not require demolition and reconstruction. However, any damage to the existing retaining wall during construction shall be restored to the original condition. The existing wall does not require underpinning. However, adequate temporary support of excavation/existing wall shall be provided for the construction of the new wall.
64	Please provide a detail for the "Guard Rail" shown in the Typical Track Section along the access road on Plan Sheets 10 and Sheet 18. Also please advise under which item the cost of this work is to be included.	Refer to Drawing C02-CT-2503 for details. Pay item 34.1 applies.
65	Please confirm the concrete sidewalk on the proposed bridge will be paid for under item 32.4 .	Confirmed
66	Chapter V – Paragraph 79 on Page 107 of the Gateway Development Commission - Tonnelle Avenue Overhead Bridge and Utility Relocations Contract Book makes reference to the contractor providing Railroad Protective Liability Insurance with limits as required by the affected railroad. Our review of the bid documents yielded no limits from any railroad. Please advise as to the limits and for which affected railroads we need the Railroad Protective Liability Insurance.	Railroad Protective Insurnace is not required for the contract.
67	Spec Section 01 74 19 Part 3.01 F describes requirements for sampling unsuitable soil for recycling / offsite management. The spec references Section 02 32 16.13 which has not been provided in the bid documents. Please review and provide the relevant spec section.	The correct reference is to Section 02 24 00, Chemical Sampling and Analysis. Specification Section 01 74 19 will be modified accordingly.
68	Plan Sheet C02-CT-2102 titled "Demolition Plan" provides limits for removal of an existing 24" thick reinformed concrete slab. Please provide the testing / disposal requirements, if any, for the concrete generated from the removal of the slab. Also, please confirm that the concrete can be crushed and reused onsite.	Refer to the following from Drawing C02-CT-2001, Demolition Notes: "1. All demolished materials and debris shall be legally disposed of off site in a manner satisfactory to the Construction Manager." The term "Construction Manager" is understood to mean"Commission Representative."
69	Please review Bid Submission Checklist Item 17 - Certification of Current Cost or pricing Date as this document/certification appears to be for Extra Work that would be performed after awarding a contract, and therefore cannot be certified at the time bid.	*See Addendum No. 5
70	Please review Bid Submission Checklist Line 15 Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, etc. First Tier Covered Transactions and Line 19 - Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, etc. Lower Tier Covered Transactions. Is the contractor simultaneously considered a first tier and second tier participant?	Please read the FRA and FTA requirememts of Section VII. The Bidder is responsponsible to submit the forms as specified in the Bid Documents and as reflected in the Bid Submission Checklist. Section VII reflects the flow down requirements for subcontractors. The FRA requires Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, etc. First Tier Covered Transactions and teh FTA requires Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, etc. Lower Tier Covered Transactions.

71	The bidders still have not been provided the actual Geotechnical Report for the project. In Addendum #1 the bidders have been provided a file labeled 4.CO7 Final GeoCalculations 021109. These are the calculations of the bridge substructure, not the actual Geotechnical Report. In the calculations on Sheet No. 5 of 28 it refers to a Trans Hudson Express Project Geotechnical Interpretive Report dated Dec 21, 2007. Please provide the relevant information to this site of the project to all bidders.	See Addendum No. 1
72	Drawing C02-ST-2522, Note 7, directs the Contractor to remove the existing soil and decomposed rock to sound rock. The Contractor is to then fill in the areas with concrete to the bottom of proposed footings. In consideration that these quantities cannot be determined prior to bid, nor can the Contractor determine the placement of the previously installed SOE and concrete fill, please consider creating separate unit price pay items for "Foundation Excavation, Foundation Excavation – Rock, Removal of Existing Concrete Foundations, and Placing Concrete Fill Under Footings" since these costs are grossly disproportionate with the unit costs of the mass quantity items in the current proposal sheet.	See Addendum No. 1
73	Please clarify why Bid Item No #1.0 for Performance & Payment Bond is an allowance item? The contract documents require these bonds on the project, so the bidder shall provide a unit price for this work, or spread the costs into the other items on the project. But the Allowance value seems to be a mistake for this item.	See Addendum No. 5
74	Please provide a detail for the 18" RCP through the retaining wall at the Detention Basin.	There are two RCP with 18" and 12" diameter that go through the retaining wall. A detail to be used for both openings will be provided by future Addendum. *See Addendum No. 7
75	The Civil plan sheets show much more Beam Guide Rail installation than the quantity of 120 ft. in proposal Item No. 34.1. Please increase the proposal quantity of Item 34.1.	See Addendum No. 5
76	Please provide an earthwork summary that illustrates where the quantities for the quantified earthwork items (31.3-31.5) are coming from.	This quantity is related to all earthwork outside of Tonnelle Ave structure, including overall site cuts-fill embankments/approaches on either side of the structure.
77	Item 31.5 - Rock Excavation. The Quantity of 4000 CY seems high for this project, can you please clarify where this rock is expected to be encountered.	This quantity is related to excavation outside of Tonnelle Ave structure.
78	Plan Page C02-CT-2093 (page 14) shows (7) seven Groundwater Monitoring Wells within the project limits. Can you please provide the groundwater data collected from these wells?	A summary of groundwater data at the site is provided with the Materials Management Plan (MMP). See Addendum No.5.
79	Please correct the response to Question 22 as Site Grading is not defined in Section 31 11 00, or provide an updated Section 31 11 00 that includes the requested information.	The corrected response is that site grading is addressed in Specification Sections 02 41 00 and 31 23 50.
80	The response to Question 48 (in reference to the 12" storm drain at the South Abutment) states to assume that the as-builts show what is built. The bid documents currently show a new storm drain installed in the identical (or nearly identical) location as the 12" storm drain from the previous contract. Are the bidders to assume that they will have to rip out the existing concrete encased storm drain and manhole in order to construct a new storm drain in essentially the same location? Or please confirm that the line shown in "stage 1 limits" was already constructed and is not part of this contract.	MH #2 and 12" pipes do exist and were abandoned under the ARC Project when it was canceled. Method of abandonment and condition of pipe and manhole after abandonment are unknown as to whether they are salvageable. The existing manhole and pipes shall be demolished and constructed anew as shown on drawing C02-CT-2141.
81	Spec Section 02 24 00 outlines the requirements for analytical testing of soil and groundwater which will not be measured and paid but included in a lump sum item. Typically sampling and analysis is paid for as a unit price since it can be difficult to quantify the number of samples required during the pre-bid phase of the project. Further, there is language in 3.02 that "no additional payment shall be made for additional sampling and analysis…as required by the Commission Representative". There is no way for the bidding contractor to quantify the amount of sampling and analysis that might be required by the Commission Representative. Please review and provide a unit price bid item to address sampling and analysis and confirm that the contractor will be paid for all sampling and analysis that is directed by the Commission.	Bid Item will be added to the Bid Form. Please provide unit costs for waste classification analyses for soils, concrete, and wastewater, and identify for each what analyses will be included. *See Addendum No. 6
82	Plan Sheet C02-CT-2102 titled "Demolition Plan", Note 4 states that "Environmental investigation and remedial action work shall be performed prior to demolition work. See remedial action plan." Please confirm that this work has been completed or will be completed prior to contractor's mobilization on site.	Remediation work has previously been completed and the Plan Sheet is being revised to remove the reference to an RAWP.
83	Spec section 01 35 13.43 titled "Special Project Procedures for Contaminated Sites" states that the Commission will be solely responsible for the designation of excavated material, soil and regulated waste material. Will the soils designated for offsite disposal be required to disposed of as RCRA regulated waste?	All regulated contaminated waste material must be disposed at a licensed facility authorized to accept the waste based on waste classification analyses. Although disposal of RCRA Hazardous waste is not anticipated, it is a possibility. A list of all proposed disposal and treatment facilities, transporters will be prepared by the Contractor and approved by the Commission prior to material leaving the work site.
84	Part 3.06 of Spec Section 33 40 01 states "Perform leakage tests of pipelines" but there's no direction of what leakage tests must be performed. In that leakage testing is not required per NJDOT standard specifications, please confirm that leakage testing is not required, and delete the referenced paragraph from the specifications. Otherwise please provide clear leakage testing guidelines.	Leakage testing of the pipelines is required. The Contractor shall review and conform with the AASHTO and ASTM standards that are cited in -Specification Section 33 40 01.
85	Plan sheet 16 indicates "EAST EXCAVATION (50'X60') EXCAVATE TO EL. 302', SEE NOTE 4" near Sta T4 4667+00. This excavation is not included in the cross sections and appears to be a deep excavation adjacent to an existing building to the north and existing retaining wall to the east. 1. Please confirm that this excavation is paid for under item 31.3, 2. No support of excavation is indicated in the plans to protect either structure. Please confirm this excavation including safe side slopes will not affect these two structures. 3. Please confirm filling the excavation will be paid under item 31.4 .	East excavation is no longer needed. Environmental investigation and remediation work was previously completed. Plan sheet will be revised to remove this work.
86	There are a lot of entities involved in this project; the GDC, the Port Authority, Amtrak, Conrail, AECOM, WSP, Parsons Brinckerhoff, STV. After the project is awarded, how will submittals be handled, will they need to go to all of these entities or will a single entity be the primary Point of Contact?	The Gateway Development Commission is the point of contact. The Construction Manager, on behalf of the Gateway Development Commission will manage the submittal process.
87	Can you confirm that all on-site testing and inspections for activities such as concrete pours, soils samplings, soils testings, compaction tests for soils and aggregates, etc. will be paid under Bid Item "Laboratory Testing & Inspection"?	This is correct, consistent with ASTM Standard E329 cited in Specification Section 01 45 29, noting however this does not cover any testing required for a Value Engineering change proposal or Value Engineering change order.
88	Can you confirm that dewatering effluent may be discharged into existing storm sewers after treatment?	The Contractor shall decide the appropriate disposal methodology and ensure that any required permits are obtained prior to disposal. Please refer to Specifications, including 02 71 00 Groundwater Treatment.
89	Plan page C02-CT-2141 (pg 22) shows a "15 inch RCP connect with exist. pipe with pipe collar see detail on dwg C02-CT-2509". However, no such detail exist on that page. Can you please provide the detail needed for the work?	The pipe collar detail will appear on drawing C02-CT-2509.
90	Plan page C02-CT-2141 (pg 22) shows various pipe runs in bold text (e.g. 15" RCP and Type B inlets) in various spots pointing to non-bold symbols. Can you confirm that these are existing items and not items to be constructed?	The pipe/inlet layers were inadvertently turned off. *See Addendum No. 7
91	Plan page C02-CT-2141 (pg 22) and plan pages C02-TF-2103 (pg 86) to plan page C02-TF-2107 (pg 90), specifically plan page C02-TF-2104 (pg 87) show drainage modifications that do not correspond to each other. For example, plan page C02-TF-2104 (pg 87) informs the contractor to "Construct Type E Inlet and Relocate as B Inlet in Stage IV" whereas plan page C02-CT-2141 (pg 22) possibly shows a new Type B inlet to be constructed. Please resubmit these plans with corresponding work items for this lump sum work.	The drawing will be revised to change "Relocate as B Inlet" to "Convert to B Inlet. *See Addendum No. 7
92	Can you provide a detail for the inlet to manhole conversion shown on plan page C02-CT-2141 (pg 22)?	The conversion will be changed from manhole to E inlet. The detail is on drawing C02-CT-2511.
93	Several spec sections mention payment item "Division 3–Concrete–2001 Tonnelle Avenue Warehouse (All Remaining Work)". This item is not listed in the Bid Form and the plans do not identify the scope of work to be performed at 2001 Tonnelle Ave. Please remove this wording from the specifications or if the item is needed, please add to the bid form, and clearly identify the scope of work.	See Bid Form, item 3.7 entitiled DIVISION 3 - CONCRETE (ALL REMAINING WORK).
94	Can you please provide the steel plate protection detail, PSE&G Gas Distribution Standard 4.2-1, P.1 as referenced on plan page C02-UT-2129 (pg 59 of plans)?	This requirement and reference shall be removed, since the pipe will have adequate cover or in the culvert box. *See Addendum No. 7
95	The location MH#1 as shown on Plan Sheets 22 and 24, will require the manhole structure to be placed through the south abutment footing. If this is the intent, please revise the south abutment footing plan to show a penetration and any sleeves that might be needed. Also, in that this manhole is entirely within rock, please provide details for the bedding/backfill requirements.	Drawing will be revised via Addendum. MH#1 will be located to avoid interference with south abutment footing.
96	At the site-visit held on 3/2 it was mentioned that a portion of the existing 2001 Tonnelle Ave retaining wall that is perpendicular to Tonnelle Ave., west of the South Abutment is to be removed as shown on the plans. Be advised that the plans do not show removal of this retaining wall. Please clearly identify the limits of retaining wall removal, if any, and confirm that the identified removal will not jeopardize the integrity or stability of the retaining wall to remain.	The limits of removal for reinforced concrete (RC) wall perpendicular to Tonnelle Ave will be shown on revised CT-2102 with Rev. A. Contractor shall construct the proposed grading between this wall and the long RC retaining wall along Tonnelle Ave. per CT-2142 prior to the partial removal of the wall perpendicular to Tonnelle Ave. *See Addendum No. 7
97	Spec section 33 10 01 stipulates that all work on water mains shall be performed by Veolia-preferred contractors. Please provide a list of Veolia-preferred contractors and associated contact information.	*See Addendum No. 7
98	There are extensive utilities "by others" listed throughout the plans but specifically on plan sheet 42. They will have a major impact to the progress schedule of the project, yet the contract documents do not appear to list any timelines for their notice, procurement, field work, commissioning, etc. Please confirm: 1. All utilities "by others" have agreements in place with the GDC. 2. Please provide all durations for the tasks listed above. 3. Please confirm the contract duration of 732 days for substantial completion excludes any and all time for these utilities "by others".	1. All utilities will have agreements in place with Amtrak by the time of the Notice to Proceed under this Contract. 2. Verizon and PSE&G are to perform utility relocation in Stage 1. Remaining utility work should be completed by the Contractor by the completion of Stage 3. 3. The contract duration is inclusive of all utilities work.

99	Page CO2-UT-2127 of the contract plans calls out “tie into existing 8” watermain” at the approach to the proposed bridge and calls for “existing 12” watermain to be relocated” at the proposed bridge. Please confirm the size of the watermain and/or if the existing watermain reduces/increases at this location.	Survey record shows both 8” and 12” on east (NB) side of roadway. Utility is unaware where it changes. The Contrator is resposnsible for verification.
100	The response to Question 20 regarding the Cross Sections states "See Addendum 4". Addendum 4 did not address the issue that was raised by Question 20. Please provide clarification regarding Question 20.	See Addendum 5 - revised Bid Form.
101	The response to Question 38 does not clarify the limits of measurement/payment for Item 32.2-Concrete Barrier Curb which has a proposal quantity of 112 LF (which doesn’t match any of the quantities provided in the response to Question 38). Please review and provide an updated proposal with the correct quantity for Item 32.2	See Addendum 5 - revised Bid Form.
102	In Addendum #1 the bidders have been provided a file labeled 4.CO7 Final GeoCalculations 021109. On Page 86 of the PDF file there is an "Evaluation of Rock Excavatability". These notes state the excavation for the new bridge goes down to elevation +314, which "will result in the need to remove bedrock to a depth of approximately 4 feet maximum". Based on the contract drawings, bridge footing excavation goes down to elevation +307.9' on the eastern side, and there is a 12" HDPE below that which requires rock excavation down to elevation +302.5'. This results in rock excavation depths of approximately 20 feet. This is much greater than the 4' stated in the report. Please provide the current "Evaluation of Rock Excavatability" to the correct elevation and depth of 20'.	See Addendum 5 - revised Bid Form.
103	Plan sheet 19 is the excavation support plan which indicates two lines of sheeting along (and parallel to) Tonnelle Ave baseline from approx. sta 130+65 to 131+70 for stageline support (labeled as Stage 1 and Stage 2). However, plan sheet 105 indicates that either three or four lines of sheeting are needed for stageline support for Stages 2A and 2B. Please clarify the requirements of stageline sheeting along Tonnelle Ave for ALL STAGES.	Will be revised to include another line of Temporary Excavation Support between two abutments for Stage 2B.
104	Plan Sheet 80 calls for the replacement of the median barrier curb at the construction driveway entrance. There is no MPT plan shown for this work, and because this barrier will need to be formed, poured, stripped and cured, it cannot be done with nightly lane closures. How does the GDC envision this work to be accomplished?	Please see Specification Section 01 35 13.01, Paragraph 1.08 A.
105	The GDC answer to Question 17 did not address the questions of costs and suggested bid items to address costs beyond the contractor's control. In good faith please address these. At a minimum, NJ Statues require a Public owner to provide allowance items for Police Traffic Directors.	*See Addendum No. 6
106	Can you confirm that existing waterlines in both stages 1 and 3 can be shut down to construct the proposed waterlines?	Contractor should confirm this with Veolia’s current policy and service arrangement.
107	Question #42 and its answer by the GDC needs further clarification. MPT plan sheets 87-90 indicate 4 stages that do not match with Structural plan sheets 104-107 which indicate 8 stages. It is our opinion that the 8 stages are correct in order to build the project envisioned by the GDC but will require far more MPT devices, shifts, relocates and striping vs. the 4 simplified stages. We applaud the freedom offered in the answer however this is not a design build project and a complete MPT design for the 8 stages are necessary so that all bidders are costing the same design.	MPT Plans are the Contractor's responsibility. Refer to Specification Section 01 35 13.01, paragraph 1.08.
108	Drawing C02-UT-2116 calls out the replacement of 12- 5” PVC conduits under the bridge encased in concrete. Are these conduits empty? If not what size conducers are in them and how far back do they need to be pulled back?	There are no data that show what was changed after removal of the previously built bridge, which carried these conduits with cables between MH#26 and MH#28.
109	Drawing C02-ST-2502 shows a detail for the 3’ curved fence to be installed on the bridge. The detail references Amtrak E.T. Standard Detail ET-1446-D, please provide this detail.	*See Addendum No. 6
	Please be advised that the current bid package nor Addenda #1 provides the necessary Geotechnical Report nor soil boring logs identified on drawing C02-ST-2101 and asbuilt drawing sheet 111 of 195. This information is required to determine the design and cost for SOE, and cost for foundation excavation and site excavation. Please provide the requested information.	All the available data have been provided.
110	Bidder’s Log responses to #7, #13, #24, and #53 are incorrect whereas Addendum No. 1 does not contain the SOE design submitted, approved, and installed under the previous contract. Please provide the information requested.	All the available data have been provided.
111	Bidder’s Log #54 implies that the Contractor may consider exploring the reuse of the existing substructure in place as a value engineering option. However, it was represented during the prebid site visit that the previous contractor may have damaged the existing substructure during the removal of the precast box beams. For the record, might this have been the case.	All the available data have been provided.
112	Refer to Intermediate Diaphragm detail on Sht. 119 (ST-2511). There is a note stating “12x5” dia. Conduits & hanger (by others) See Note 2.” Note 2 states “Utility hangers shall not project below bottom of beams.” Please clarify what the Contractor’s responsibility is for the conduit and hanger shown.	The clearance between the bottom of beams and top of rail must be maintained. Note 2 on Drawing C02-ST-2511 explains fully the Contractor’s responsibility. The shop drawings for these items shall conform.
113	Please provide a list of utility owner approved contractors for the Veolia water main work. Only contractors for the PSEG work were given.	*See Addendum No. 7
114	If no allowance will be provided for the Uniform Traffic Control Police Officers, please provide an hourly rate that the General Contractor is to use for the use of Police Officers during required work activities.	*See Addendum No. 6
115	Can you confirm that Existing MH#2 that will be demoed (See Bidder's Log 8, #60) and constructed anew has the same invert as the both existing and proposed? If not please provide the existing grate and invert for this deep manhole.	Confirmed.
116	Please provide specification section 02 22 10, describing the pre/post construction survey requirements.	This section was included with the Bid Documents and is being revised by Addendum. *See Addendum No. 7
117	The Contractor is unable to determine the quantity of suitable, non-contaminated and non-hazardous soil onsite that is available for reuse prior to the bid. This therefore makes the potential for required imported embankment material unknown, due to the various levels of contamination and suitability to be determined once work commences. Please consider creating a new unit price bid item for the purchase and import of clean embankment/borrow/fill.	The quantity of clean fill is covered in Bid Item 31.4. Specification Section 31 23 50 will be modified by Addendum to remove provision for re-used fill.
118	Bidder’s Log response #8 does not answer whether Railroad Protective Liability Insurance will be required for working within 50ft of the Conrail / NYS&W railroad, nor does it answer the number and speed of trains. Please respond as requested.	Railroad Protective Insurance is not required for this Contract unless the Contractor's means and methods encroach on the 50' clearance from the ROW.
119	Please refer to contract drawing C02-CT-2142 and C02-CT-2514. There appears to be four outlets shown, however information for only three are given. Please provide the missing information.	A profile was created for outlet #4 on CT-2143 and will be issued via Addendum. *See Addendum No. 7
120	Regarding the existing sheeting that was installed in the previous contract, responses back to questions on this topic are all “See Addendum No. 1”. After further review of Addendum No. 1 and its attachments there is no mention of what exactly was installed in this contract. Attachment “C07 FINAL GeoCalculation” is a design parameter for a support of excavation system in this area but not anything of specifics that would lead the contract to know what is in place on this current contract. Attachment “C07 As-Built Dwgs” is the as-builts for the previous contract that was cancelled and removed as part of the cancellation of the ARC program. In the as-built drawings there is also no mention or reference of the existing support of excavation system installed in this contract. Please provide submittals that would have been submitted by the previous General Contract and approved by the ARC program with regards to the furnishing and installation of the support of excavation system used for this previous contract. Without the information we are unsure what is in place and how we are to remove/modify/handle this existing condition.	All the available data have been provided.
121	Please provide an anchor bolt detail for the concrete box beams. Sht. 115 (ST-2507) directs you to Sh. 118 (ST-2510), however the anchor bolts are not shown or specified.	The callout of “anchor bolt” will be changed to “anchor rods”. The details of 3” hole in concrete box beam for anchor rod is shown on ST-2510. *See Addendum No. 7
122	Refer to the prestressed concrete box beam Typical Insert Location Details on Sht. 118 (ST-2510.) Are the couplers and threaded inserts accounted for in the provided Bar Schedules? Table 1 Reinforcement Schedule on Sht. 117 (ST-2509) does not appear to account for the #19 coupler, and the end diaphragm Bar Schedules on Sht. 141 (ST-2602) do not appear to account for the #19 threaded end over the abutments & pier. Are the #19 couplers and threaded inserts in addition to the bars listed in their respective Bar Schedules, or should the Remarks section in each chart be modified to reflect which bars account for the couplers/inserts?	#19 Threaded inserts (embedded in precast box beam) are considered miscellaneous items, and will not be included in Table 1 on Dwg. 117 (ST-2509). A note of “ one threaded end is required and it is not included in the bar length” will be added in Remarks section for bar mark 19ED05 on sheet 141 (ST-2602). *See Addendum No. 7
123	Refer to Sht. 119 (ST-2511), Sht. 118 (ST-2510), and Sht. 117 (ST-2509). Are the #19 couplers (embedded in precast box beams) and #19 threaded inserts (cast in end diaphragm) uncoated or epoxy coated?	#19 threaded inserts (embedded in precast box beam) shall be hot-dipped galvanized. #19 rebar with threaded end (cast in diaphragm) shall be epoxy coated, see ST-2602.
124	Refer to Sht. 116 (ST-2508) and Sht. Sht. 119 (ST-2511.) Please specify coating for 7/8” inserts & 7/8” bolts connecting steel diaphragms to the precast concrete box beam.	Hot-dipped galvanized inserts and anchor bolts shall be used.
125	Refer to Sht. 119 (ST-2511.) Please specify coating for 7/8” bolts at the steel diaphragm to bent connection plate connection.	Hot-dipped galvanized high-Strength anchor bolts per NJDOT Section 908.02 shall be used.
126	Refer to Sht. 115 (ST-2507) and Sht. 119 (ST-2511.). Please confirm that all diaphragms, connection plates, and other steel components of the roadway bridge shall be coated with the three coat IEU paint system specified in Note 6.D on Sht. 102 (ST-2101.)	Yes, all diaphragms, connection plates, and other steel components of the roadway bridge shall be coated with the three coat IEU paint system specified in Note 6.D on Sht. 102 (ST-2101.)
127	Refer to contract drawing C02-CT-2102. Please provide more details on the existing retainage wall to be removed.	A detail/section view was added to CT-2102 and will be provided via Addendum. *See Addendum No. 7

128	Please expand upon the GDC answer to question #86 regarding all the noted entities. With such a tight schedule and large liquidated damages, the shop drawing/submittal review process with a tremendous amount of entities needs to be expedited and is crucial to timing of the project. 1. Please confirm that all entities have project agreements with the GDC to provide timely review of submittals and will begin review at time of contractor's award of contract. 2. Please confirm the GDC will provide comments/return any and all submittals to the contractor within 15 calendar days and shall include a complete and composite review by all applicable entities. Also, Please provide specification section 02 22 10, describing the pre/post construction survey requirements.	Specification Section 02 22 10 is part of the Bid Documents.
129	Numerous questions have been asked by bidders about the existing sheeting currently in place from the original contract, yet the GDC has not complied with the conclusive request of providing the shop drawings and calculations for it. (As-builts provided in Addendum #1 are not shop drawings and do not help.) The proposed sheeting is probably the most time consuming and complicated aspect of this project, in its own right, given its height, staging requirements, high rock elevation, tiebacks, etc. Adding a critical unknown of existing sheeting and how it conflicts or impacts this project's sheeting makes it now so far beyond an industry standard risk to be taken by a bidder. The GDC responses state "contractor's means and methods" and not being responsible, etc. The issue is well beyond "contractor's means and methods" and the GDC needs to provide this information which is certainly available. Although it's been years since the original project took place, it appears the GDC has enough consultants to track down this shop drawing and provide it to the bidders. As a result, please provide these pertinent documents to all bidders.	*See Addendum No. 7
130	Note # 07 on drawing CO2-ST-2103 indicated "The steel box beam stiffening of construction barrier curb with attachment B as shown on CD-159-3 shall be made of cold – formed welded and seamless structural tubing, …. Etc., We couldn't locate CD-159-3 within the bid documents, please advise.	See Addendum No. 6
131	Were the ground anchors from the abandoned support of excavation de-tensioned/destressed?	It is not known for certain whether excavation support is destressed, but you can assume the tieback has been destressed.
132	Drawing GT-51201 from the As-Builts Drawing Set notes "The Contractor's attention is directed to the geotechnical foundation engineering report for this contact that presents the detailed soil boring and rock coring logs represented in the geotechnical profiles illustrated above". Please provide the full geotechnical report that were provided for the ARC project.	*See Addendum No. 7
133	Contract Book 02092023, Page 191: Work hours are listed as 7am-3pm & 3pm-11pm shifts. Please clarify the Contractor can work any combination of shifts 1st - 3rd, and not limited to only 1st, 2nd?	Work is limited to the times listed. Bid as shown.
134	Plan Sheet 19, Permanent Excavation Support: Please clarify the Contractor can utilize any type of material to be submitted for permanent support, or is a particular type of material required for permanent support left in place?	Follow material requirements in Specification Section 31 50 00.
	* Please note - The response to question 49, highlighted in red has be revised.	