

PORT OF INDIANA-BURNS HARBOR
PORTAGE, PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA

ADDENDUM NO. 4
TO
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS

FOR
CONTRACT BH-2023-C1
Enhanced Intermodal Facilities
Construction of Berths 16/17 and Berth 5
MARAD FY 17 FASTLANE Grant No. 693JF71810002

This Addendum is intended to answer questions of the Engineer and Owner and to issue clarifications to the Bid Documents.

“Attachment A” includes all remaining Questions/Answers and clarifications as a result of questions asked by prospective bidders. “Attachment A” hereby becomes part of the bid documents.

Addendum No. 5, including an updated set of plans and bid documents, will be issued on or before July 14, 2023.

Prospective Bidders shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by signing and including with the Proposer’s Bid Form.

RECEIPT IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED OF ADDENDUM NO. 4

SIGNED: _____ DATE: _____

FIRM: _____

Ports of Indiana
Addendum No. 4
Contract BH-2023-C1

**Ports of Indiana – BH-2023-C1
Enhanced Intermodal Facilities
Construction of Berths 16/17 and Berth 5**

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.23

1. The specification for Pay Item RIPRAP (CLASS R7) indicates to follow INDOT spec 616. The INDOT specifications do not provide a gradation for a Class R7. Please provide specifications on the stone. Also does this riprap require a bedding stone? If so, please provide gradation and thickness details.
 - Response: INDOT Class 1 riprap. Bedding stone is not required. 24-inch thickness.
2. On plan sheet C-16, it is called out on item “H” as remove and reset existing post. The appears to coincide with the pay item “Post Remove and Reset”. The posts appear to be driven pile and/or a bollard filled with concrete. Can you please provide more detail on the as built information for these posts and how they can be reinstalled.
 - Response: POI has provided all known as-built information in the files. This pay item will read “Post, Remove”.
3. Can you please confirm that after Addendum #2, there are no longer any MBE/DBE goals to meet?
 - Response: No – Please see ITB-15

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.26

4. Will previously submitted questions that were not included in Addendum No. 2 or addressed by revisions still be answered?
 - Response: Yes
5. Addendum No. 2 states to strike page (section) ITB-12 from the original bid documents and ITB-15 states the Owner has set a DBE Goal of 10%. Confirm if the 10% DBE goal can be met with companies on the INDOT certified DBE list and / or IDOA certified M/WBE list. Some companies are on both lists whereas some companies are on only one of the lists.
 - Response: Companies can to be on either list – they do not have to be on both.
6. Addendum No. 2 provided a revised bid form with unit prices for individual proposed items that are summed in a bid price for a lump sum pay item total. Will this be revised to provide proposed item totals like the original bid form included? This is not a typical format for bid forms.
 - Response: A new bid form will be provided in a future Addendum.
7. What is the intent for payment, unit pricing for the quantities installed or lump sum? How will quantity discrepancies be handled, there appears to be numerous items that need quantity adjustments. There is conflicting information in the documents.
 - Response: Items with a designated bid unit as lump sum in the revised bid tab will be paid for as a lump sum. Items with a designated bid unit that is not lump sum in the revised bid tab will be paid at unit price for the quantities actually installed and approved. A new bid form will be provided in a future Addendum.
8. Addendum No. 2 increased the requirements and responsibilities of the Contractor’s hired Geotechnical Engineer. Can a technical specification be provided identifying the complete scope of work and requirements that the Geotechnical Engineer must meet and base their pricing on.

- Response: The Contractor's Geotechnical engineer is responsible for determining the geotechnical capacity and driven pile lengths required to resist the service level design forces provided in the contract plans. Forces will be updated in a future Addendum. The Geotechnical Engineer shall be prequalified by InDOT in Work Type 7.1 Geotechnical Engineering Services. The Geotechnical Engineer is not responsible for confirming that the steel piles called out in the plans are structurally adequate to resist the anticipated loading. However, the Contractor's Geotechnical Engineer is required to retrieve/determine any additional information needed including (as necessary) but not limited to material samples, test samples, determine appropriate geotechnical properties for the soils present and design the required embedment depth of the steel piles in accordance with InDOT Policies, Practices, and Procedures. Further, any necessary splicing or appurtenances required by design or for installation of the piles will be the responsibility of the Contractor/Geotechnical Engineer, at no additional cost to the project.
9. Will the Contractor hired Geotechnical Engineer need to be on INDOT's list of Prequalified Consultants?
 - Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
 10. Addendum No. 2 answered Question 29 stating all available geotechnical information has been distributed with the Contract Plans. Is there any additional design information for the piling as Question 33 states pile design and pile end treatments are the responsibility of the Contractor and their Geotechnical Engineer. This was also added to the technical specifications.
 - Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
 11. Confirm if corrosion protection is required for any piling. The original and revised technical specifications reference corrosion protection, but this is not called for in the plans.
 - Response: No corrosion protection is required for the piling.
 12. Addendum No. 2 Question 33 answer states pile end protection is not a requirement and did not clarify filling the pipe pile with concrete. Assuming the pipe pile are to be filled with concrete, if end plates or tips are not used is there any requirement for removing soil from inside of the pile prior to filling with concrete?
 - Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
 13. Confirm the neatline slope for the Berth 16/17 structural backfill. The note says 1V:2H, but it appears to be drawn 1V:1H. See Plan Sheets C-8 through C-15. This will require a quantity adjustment to proposed items when verified (earth fill and structural backfill).
 - Response: The slope shall be 1V:2H. Earthwork quantities have been updated to reflect the slope of 1V:2H.
 14. Are there any existing plans that show the tie backs at Berth 16/17? Or is the spacing known?
 - No additional information is known on the tiebacks. Contractor shall take necessary precautions to avoid damaging the tie-backs/retaining wall support system. Any damage to tie-backs/retaining wall support system shall be repaired by the Contractor at no additional cost to the Ports.
 15. Addendum 2, Clarification 8 – Tree Clearing provided clarification regarding tree removal, but the bid form was not changed accordingly. Update the bid form per the current information.
 - Response: Refer to the response for Item 6.
 16. Addendum 2 answer to Question 26 states to see Note 4 on Sheet G-2. Note 4 was not updated on the revised plans. Update the Plan Sheet to specify what is required.
 - Response: A future Addendum will be provided.

17. Addendum 2 answers regarding maintaining access to the public fishing area state to see revisions to Note 2 on G-2 or reference revised notes. Site Security & Traffic Management Note was not revised. Provide the revised note.
 - Response: A future Addendum will be provided.
18. Addendum 2 question 53 appears to have been copied from a previous question and the answer is different. Provide the correct question for question 53. The Addendum Receipt and Acknowledgement references Addendum No. 1. Correct the addendum number.
 - Response: Addendum 2, Question 53 was inadvertently copied from question 52. Please disregard the answer to Question 53
19. Addendum No. 2 changed the reference to IDOT Standard Specifications in the technical specifications, but the gradations for aggregates have not been revised. Revise the aggregate gradations per INDOT Standard Specifications.
 - Response: A future Addendum will provide equivalent INDOT material specifications.
20. Are slag aggregates permissible for this project?
 - Response: Acceptable aggregates for concrete, asphalt, etc. will be according to INDOT specifications.
21. Geogrid is called out on Plan Sheet C-26 under ballast, but a pay item was not included. Confirm if this is required, and if so, add the pay item and the type required.
 - Response: Geogrid Type 1B is required. A pay item has been added.
22. Pay items for track work shown on Plan Sheet C-26 have not been added to the Bid Form. Addendum No. 2 Question 22 addressed the type of rail required but did not add the appropriate items. Will the pay items be added to the bid form? What is the length of track to be replaced? The technical specification states to furnish rail in 39' lengths, so is this the length of track to be replaced at the precast concrete crossing?
 - Response: The four tracks should be rebuilt to the nearest existing rail joints outside of the proposed concrete crossing panel limits
23. Plan Sheet C-26 has a detail for the precast concrete crossing which appears to show Omni's Embedded Concrete-Rubber crossing system whereas the technical specifications call for Omni's Improved-Concrete crossing system. Which is correct? Also provide the appropriate length in the Bid Form based on the crossing system required, 150 LF was included, but the panels are in 8' or 9' increments, depending on the type.
 - Response: The plans and technical specifications will be revised to show the correct Omni products detail in a future addendum.
24. Will information regarding track outages be provided in order to determine when the railroad crossing reconstruction can occur?
 - Response: Coordination with POI will be addressed during the project.
25. Addendum No. 2 answered Question 46 regarding TWIC cards and they are the responsibility of the contractor. After reviewing the link, it is not clear if all workers onsite will require a TWIC card. Provide the Ports requirements for who will be required to hold a TWIC card. The period for obtaining a TWIC card could also be sixty (60) days after scheduling and attending an application appointment, which could delay the start of work.
 - Response: The Port follows the guidelines provided in addendum #2.
26. Addendum No. 2 Question 54 states the Contractor is to adjust the water valve to finish grade during construction at Berth 5. Will a pay item be added for this work?

- Response: Adjusting water valve to grade was previously included under the pay item, Adjust Casting to Grade. The pay item Adjust Water Valve to Grade has been added.
27. The existing plans show timber fenders attached to the existing sheet piling using angles. Are the timber fenders still on the dock wall? If so, some of the sections show the elevation to be against new dock wall concrete being constructed.
- Response: Timber fenders are no longer attached to the dock wall.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.28 A

28. An initial response from a Geotechnical Consultant regarding the piling in general, questioned how the estimated pile tip and pile capacities were developed after review of the geotechnical information provided. Please provide any additional information used for determining the estimated pile tips and capacities. Initial analysis of the mooring dolphin piling indicates < 200 kips ultimate compressive resistance and 300 kips is noted on the plans.
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
29. Confirm if the required pile capacity noted for each location is intended to be Nominal Compressive / Tensile Resistance (Ultimate Load) or Service Load. Both terms are listed in the notes and the design would need to be factored if these are Service Loads.
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
30. Currently soil borings for Berth 5 do not appear to be deep enough to confirm the required pile tips and capacities as most borings end around Elev. 490 and do not appear to have adequate bearing capacity in this soil layer. Additionally, soil borings 5-01 & 5-02 which are plotted in line with the existing mooring dolphin on the soil boring map show a water depth of approximately 43' whereas Plan Sheet S-10 indicates a water depth of 26' based on current lake levels and the channel bottom shown in Section K-K. Confirm which is correct as this will impact pile design and other costs for the project.
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 8. Channel bottom elevations listed on S-10 are based on soundings taken in the field. The location of the soil borings shown on the map in the geotechnical report may not be exact and may have been taken further out in the channel.
31. Confirm if the Contractor will be reimbursed for additional soil borings if required to determine the final pile tip and capacity?
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
32. Confirm PDA and CAPWAP analysis is acceptable to the Ports of Indiana and Engineer of Record for verification of pile capacities.
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
33. Confirm if the pile capacity required is dependent on the method of capacity confirmation (i.e. PDA vs. static load test)?
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
34. Plan Sheet S-6 calls for drilling the sheet piling for the rebar that extends through. This note is not included on any other sheet, but penetrations are required for rebar. Confirm flame cutting holes in the sheet pile for rebar and form tie penetrations is permissible.
- Response: Flame cutting is permissible.
35. Plan Sheet S-3 (and additional sheets) includes a section of the dock wall at Berth 16/17. After review of this detail, would an alternate to the D4 bars be acceptable? From a constructability standpoint, these U-shaped bars would need to be installed prior to any formwork, whereas (2) L-shaped bars would allow for

one side of the form to be installed. Also, with shear studs being installed, does this bar need to penetrate the sheet pile?

- Response: Alternates to the D4 bar are acceptable provided the bar penetrates the sheet pile and the lap length for the reinforcement fully develops the bar. Any alternate rebar configurations shall be submitted for approval prior to fabrication. The submittal shall include calculations showing that the alternate detail fully develops the reinforcing bar. The submittal shall be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Indiana.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.28 B

36. The plans for the pile refer to capacities as nominal compressive force resistance (service). The nominal implies the load is factored and this capacity is ultimate, the service implies that this is an unfactored load. Can you please clarify the loading requirements of the pile.
 - Response: Refer to the response for Item 8.
37. Will contractor be paid for actual quantities installed based on submitted unit prices, or will we be paid based on the lump sum units?
 - Response: Refer to the response for Item 7.
38. Addendum #2 – Clarification question #8 states that POI will remove the trees at Berth 5. However there is still an item for TREE REMOVAL 99 EA. Should this pay item be removed, or should we put a unit price of \$0.00?
 - Response: Some trees have been cut down, but still remain on site. The trees will still need to be removed from the site and stumps removed in accordance with the special provisions/technical specifications.
39. Please provide the email address that an electronic bid is to be submitted to. Can you also confirm that the bid opening will be at 150 W Market Street, Suite 450, Indianapolis, IN.
 - Response: Bids@portsofindiana.com

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.29 A

40. Plan sheet E-5, there is a call out that “exist. pipe pile fender to be removed”, that is 15’ off of the sheet pile wall located to the west of the existing mooring dolphin at approx station 0+00. However, this is located in the area that per Sheet S-9 is outside the limits of Berth5 and is not included in the contract. If the pipe pile fender is to be removed as part of this contract, please provide more details for its removal.
 - Response: There is no additional information available on the existing pipe pile fender to be removed. Regardless of the pipe pile fender’s location, its removal is included in the contract.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.29 B

41. Berth 5 - Bid Item #4: Temporary Geotextile 78 SY. Where and what is this temporary geotextile to be used for?
 - Response: Temporary geotextile is to be placed under the No. 2 course aggregate used for the construction entrance.
42. Berth 5 - Bid Item #13: Will the Normal Dual Wall N-12 HDPE storm sewer pipe with a smooth interior and corrugated exterior be acceptable for the 12", 18" and 24" HDPE storm Pipe shown on drawings?

- Response: Yes.
43. Berth 16/17 - Bid Item #13: Will the Normal Dual Wall N-12 HDPE storm sewer pipe with a smooth interior and corrugated exterior be acceptable for the 24" HDPE storm Pipe shown on drawings?
- Response: Yes, however we will defer to manufacturer recommendations for the preferred pipe to be used given the proposed site conditions. The design intent was to use normal HDPE dual wall pipe.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.06.30

44. Based on the discussion of a bid extension at the pre-bid meeting, this would allow time for changing the bid form and contract to unit price instead of lump sum, which would be beneficial to all parties. This would reduce risk and allow for more competitive pricing.
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 7.
45. It was stated at the pre-bid meeting that work not clearly defined before the bid date would be addressed by change order with the successful contractor. Can the items being considered as potential change orders be identified? This would be beneficial to all parties for establishing the basis of bid.
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 7.
46. Confirm if clarifications submitted with the bid are acceptable for items not clearly defined prior to the bid date. This would be beneficial to all parties for establishing the basis of bid.
- Response: Clarifications submitted with the bid are unacceptable.
47. Addendum No. 2 Question 43 answer states the Contractor may maintain optional construction joints to avoid mass concrete pour requirements per INDOT specifications. INDOT does not have a specification addressing this and will issue a Unique Special Provision for a project if required. Can the allowable optional construction joints for Dock Wall Panel E (S-5) and the Mooring Dolphin (S-10) concrete be provided?
- Response: A Temperature Control plan shall be submitted by the Contractor for approval. The contract documents will be updated with requirement for the Temperature Control Plan in a future Addendum. The Contractor may submit a proposed construction joint plan to the Ports of Indiana for approval. No additional construction joint information will be provided.
48. Addendum No. 2 changed the Existing Structure Concrete Repairs pay item to a quantity of 1,000 SF. Plan details and a technical specification were not provided. The note on Plan Sheet G-4 states the actual quantity will be paid for. Confirm this will following INDOT measurement and payment for Patching Concrete Structures where the first 4" of depth are included and depths of repairs greater than 4" are factored for payment. Also confirm reinforcing steel replaced will be paid for. The revised note on Plan Sheet G-3 did not address this.
- Response: Existing Structure Concrete Repairs shall follow INDOT Standard Specifications, Section 710 - Patching Concrete Structures and Repointing Masonry in Structures. Replacement of reinforcement steel as required by the INDOT Standard Specifications shall not be measured separately for payment.
49. For the Existing Structure Concrete Repairs, who will inspect and mark the repair areas for approval from the Ports of Indiana and Resident Engineer? See Plan Sheet G-3 Note 4.
- Response: POI's on-site representatives (ESI) will coordinate this inspection.
50. Confirm if shotcrete is permissible for the Existing Structure Concrete Repairs.
- Response: Shotcrete is not permissible.

51. Who will be responsible for removing the fendering system for the Existing Structure Concrete Repairs to be made? Will this be performed by others or is the contractor to include this work?
- Response: The Contractor shall remove, protect, and reinstall the existing fenders as necessary to carry out the concrete repairs.
52. Will concrete repairs to the existing mooring bollard foundations be included in the Existing Structure Concrete Repairs pay item?
- Response: Any concrete repairs identified in the field (including at the existing mooring bollard foundations) shall be paid under the Existing Structure Concrete Repairs pay item. The Contractor shall be paid for the actual quantity of repairs performed.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED 2023.07.06

53. The modular seals at the storm sewer penetrations for Berth 5 (sheet C-25) call out specific link seal models. But the penetrations at Berth 16/17 (sheet C-7) state “modular sealer as required”. Do the penetrations at Berth 16/17 require a link seal? Can you please clarify the seal that is required at these penetrations.
- Response: Modular Sealer will not be required for pipe penetrations located at Berth 16/17. The proposed bulkhead wall can be cast around the proposed 24” HDPE Storm drain pipe. The plans will be revised to reflect these changes to the outfall pipe detail.
54. For the concrete bulkhead walls at Berth 16/17, does rebar piece mark “D4” require the drilling of a hole in the existing sheet pile?
- Response: Refer to the response for Item 36.
55. Note 6, on Plan Sheet S-8 indicates pavement striping is to be installed on the crane pads. How is this pavement marking to be paid? Can a plan sheet showing the striping be provided.
- Response: Striping shall consist of an 8” wide white line around the perimeter of both the new and existing crane pads. The striping shall be paid for under the Pay Item “HMA Pavement”.