



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

6/27/2012 9:26:07 AM

District Address: District 5 Construction Office, located at 719 South Woodland Blvd, Deland, FL 32720

District Phone: (386) 943-5350

Proposal: T5419

Project: 239535-5-52-01

Letting Date: 6/27/2012

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 50

Question: 725: Water/Sewer/Utilities Plans; After download and review of the plans package for this project, we can not find any plans for the proposed City of Ocoee or Orange County Utilities work. Please post/provide these plans or direct us how to obtain them ASAP. Posted: 5/24/2012 10:20:12 PM

Answer: Utility Plans for FM Nos. 23953555601 and 23953555602 are now available on the Online Ordering System. It is posted as one file containing all three projects (FM 23953555201, 23953555601, 23953555602). Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/5/2012 3:28:57 PM

Question: 765: Can the department make the Comp books available? Posted: 5/30/2012 9:04:55 AM

Answer: The Department does not guarantee the details or computations contained within the computation book. The computation book is provided for informational purposes only and is not part of the contract documents. The bidder shall make independent calculations and base the bid solely on these calculations. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/6/2012 7:24:29 AM

The bidder's submission of a proposal is prima facie evidence that the bidder has not relied on the computation book. No claim for compensation may be based on an inaccuracy contained within the computation book.

The computation book is available for download from your order history in online ordering.URL:
<https://www3.dot.state.fl.us/ContractProposalProcessingOnlineOrdering/>

Question: 766: Can the Department make the geotechnical reports available? Posted: 5/30/2012 9:05:28 AM

Answer: SR 50 Mast Arm Traffic Signal Poles, SR 50 Soil Survey Report, and the SR 50 Structures/Appendix D Report are all now available on the Online Ordering System. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/15/2012 3:13:22 PM

Question: 771: With respect to item 0530-3-4 the drawings depict 12.56 tns of Rubble Rip Rap located Pond 4 however the plan quantity is 236 tns. Please identify where the other locations are. Posted: 5/30/2012 9:52:03 AM

Answer: The correct quantity for item 530-3-4 is 12.6 TN. Please bid it accordingly. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/15/2012 3:13:58 PM

Question: 794: In reference to pay item 400-4-5, 67.9 cy, is this used for payment for the temp box culvert, or is the temp culvert paid under 102-1 per the plan notes on sheet 11? Posted: 5/31/2012 10:06:42 AM

Answer: Please follow the plan notes on sheet 11. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/15/2012 3:14:09 PM

Question: 810: Will any work, activity, or access be permitted outside of the shown ROW limits in the water areas of the lake, between app. Sta. 884+00 to 896+00? Or will ALL construction activity and access be limited to the area inside of this ROW area only? Posted: 6/1/2012 7:27:49 AM

Answer: Work, activity, or access will be permitted outside of the shown ROW limits in the water areas of the lake that is owned by FDOT as shown on the attached for FDOT Parcel 141 North side and Southside. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/15/2012 3:14:48 PM

Work, activity, or access will be permitted outside of the shown ROW limits in the water areas of the lake that is not owned by FDOT as shown on the attached for Vizcaya Lakes Apartments, for Vizcaya Lakes Apartments and the Lakebed on the north side upon obtaining written permission from the property owners and assume all liability for any damages and obtaining any required permits if any to work outside of the ROW.

Document: 1680271: FDOT Parcel 141 Northside.pdf

FDOT Parcel 141 Northside

Document: 1680272: FDOT Parcel 141 Southside.pdf

FDOT Parcel 141 Southside

Document: 1680273: Good Homes Plaza.pdf

Good Homes Plaza

Document: 1680274: Vizcaya Lakes Apartments.pdf

Vizcaya Lakes Apartments

Question:	811: There is no soil boring information provided in the cross sections for the area to be excavated between Sta. 886+50 to 893+90. Additionally the plan notes on plan page 11 state that "Excavated material shall not be used as fill material unless deemed select and/or directed by the Engineer". In order to assess the suitability of this excavated material borings and analysis must be provided, unless this material is to be classified as possibly unsuitable/unusable for the project as noted. Please provide borings and analysis for this area or clarify if the material excavated from this area will be unsuitable/unusable on the project.	Posted:	6/1/2012 7:34:37 AM
Answer:	Soil borings for this station range are included in the report of SPT borings for structures, plan sheets BI-8 through BI-12, but are located outside the limits of the removal of the earthen causeway. FDOT Standard Index 505 and Specification 120-7 provide additional information regarding potential embankment utilization.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/8/2012 12:27:41 PM
Question:	812: Temporary Fence; Plan page 105 (MT) note 6 states that a temporary fence is to be installed along the entire roadway as a pedestrian barrier. there are no details for this temporary fence. What is the required height of this fence? Can it be free standing or will the posts be required to be ground mounted? Is the payment/cost to be included in the project MOT (102-1) or another item? Please provide details or requirements for this temporary fence and clarify where the costs for it are to be included.	Posted:	6/1/2012 7:40:22 AM
Answer:	The cost for installing and maintaining the temporary pedestrian routes, including the associated fencing depicted on sheet 105, should be included under pay item 102-1. The fence should be a standard 5' Type B Fence (FDOT Standard Index 802). A free standing fence will be acceptable when the adjacent sheet pile wall is higher than 3'-6" above the sidewalk. The bases cannot encroach into the clear width of the pedestrian route.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/8/2012 12:28:48 PM
Question:	843: Removal of Existing Structure (Box Culvert)- Does the existing box culvert to be removed require complete removal, including the bottom slab and all other material, or can the bottom or any other portion of this structure be left in place/crushed left in place. Please clarify if entire structure including bottom slab is required to be removed or other alternate as mentioned.	Posted:	6/4/2012 8:30:45 PM

Answer:	The existing box culvert structure should be completely removed in accordance with the plans and specifications. Payment is included under pay item 110-3.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/8/2012 12:34:22 PM
Question:	881: Water/Sewer Bridge Pipe; Plan notes state that all under deck/bridge piping for the proposed water/sewer is to be push joint type with restrainer gaskets. Will any other types be allowed/permitted to be utilized, such as typical flanged joint DIP pipe? Please confirm if push joint with restrained gasket pipe will be the only pipe allowed for this installation or clarify if and what other alternate pipe/joint types will be allowed to be utilized for this project.	Posted: 6/7/2012 10:09:57 PM
Answer:	Only use push-on pipe with restrainer gaskets for the bridge crossing pipe.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/15/2012 3:31:40 PM
Question:	882: DIP Pipe (Buried- Water/Sewer); Will the proposed buried water/sewer DIP piping be required to be poly wrapped?	Posted: 6/7/2012 10:12:11 PM
Answer:	The direct bury pipe does not require poly-wrap. As long as the pipe is marked with two strips of appropriately colored adhesive tape then the use of appropriately colored poly wrap is not required. The geotechnical report did not indicate corrosive soils. Orange County Utilities requires PE encasement on DIP for this project as noted in T02510 2.01 D.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/15/2012 3:18:42 PM
Question:	889: In reference to the MOT and traffic shifts, it appears sacrificial milling and paving is required for every traffic shift in lieu of removing pavement marking by approved methods such as waterblasting. Please confirm this is correct, as this is very costly.	Posted: 6/8/2012 2:01:05 PM
Answer:	This is correct, temporary pavement markings shall be removed via sacrificial milling and resurfacing where indicated in the plans per Department preference.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/8/2012 8:18:39 PM
Question:	913: On the signing and pavement plans you have it showing the special emphasis crosswalks being in the old specs. New FDOT standards show the longitudinal lines being 24" wide with maximum space between markings not exceeding 60". Can you please clarify what specs you are using for this project?	Posted: 6/11/2012 1:19:33 PM

Answer:	Use the specs shown in the bid package.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/15/2012 3:21:41 PM
Question:	952: On plan sheet 105 in the special detour summary - 102-2-3 special detour 3 shows the quantity for temporary pavement OBG 06 is 3,767.2 SY and TYPE SP (TRAFFIC C) is 414.4 TONS, we are unable to identify these quantities for this phase. Please clarify	Posted:	6/13/2012 9:19:06 AM
Answer:	The temporary pavement identified in the table on plan sheet 105 is shown on the phase III traffic control plan typical section on plan sheet 106. The limits of the temporary pavement are bound by the EB PGL and the location of the temporary westbound white stripe to be constructed in Phase IV between stations 880 through 886 and 894+20 through 903+50. The actual amount will be dependent upon how much of the permanent pavement is constructed during phase II.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/15/2012 3:19:10 PM
Question:	983: Bid Item 400-4-11 Class IV Conc Retaining Wall has a Plan Qty of 172.5 cys. Item 415-1-3 Reinforcing Steel - Retaining Wall has a qty of 9813 lbs. Plan Sheet BW-20 provides details for Wall AA with a quantity of 98.7 cys and 9813 lbs. Where is the additional 83.8 cys located on the project?	Posted:	6/14/2012 4:48:47 PM
Answer:	The 98.7 cy quantity identified on plan sheet BW-20 for 400-4-11 is correct and is the quantity that should be bid.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/15/2012 3:33:38 PM
Question:	984: Bid Item 400-4-11 Class IV Concrete has a bid qty of 172.5 cys. Wall AA details on PS BW-20 indicate that 98.7 cys are required. Where is the other 83.8 cys located on the project?	Posted:	6/14/2012 4:50:45 PM
Answer:	See response to Bid Question 983, this question appears to be a duplicate.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/15/2012 3:33:43 PM
Question:	1001: Quantity Corrections; Responses to several previous questions prior to the bid date postponement confirmed that there are incorrect bid quantities for several bid items. The recent amendment does not address any of these quantity corrections/issues. Will these quantities be adjusted/corrected and another amendment be issued prior to the new bid due date?	Posted:	6/19/2012 10:25:12 AM
Answer:	Plans Revision One will be issued prior to the new bid due date.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/20/2012 2:03:38 PM

Question: 1002: Existing Retaining Wall at Vizcaya; On plan pages 68-70 (Cross Sections) it appears the existing retaining wall at the Vizcaya Lake entrance will be eliminated/covered. Will the wall be required to be removed in the embankment operations or is it to remain and be buried/covered as depicted? Please clarify if this wall is to be removed or to remain in embankment.

Posted: 6/19/2012 10:29:02 AM

Answer: The exiting wall is to remain as noted in the plans.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/20/2012 2:04:10 PM

Question: 1003: 0526 1 1- Pavers, Architectural, Roadway; There are no details or standards for the "pavers" application as shown. Section 526 only describes architectural pavers for use in roadways, driveways, and other driving surfaces, not for erosion applications. Further no pavers as per 526 have open cells that would be sand filled as per the plan notes. Is it the intent to utilize brick or concrete roadway pavers for this project application, or another type/system such as Turf Block? Please provide details, product or manufacturer information for this work and material so that it can be bid accordingly.

Posted: 6/19/2012 10:34:28 AM

Answer: It is the intent of the plans to utilize architectural roadway pavers as specified. The plan note states "fill voids with A-3 sand" and refers to openings between pavers and not open cells within the pavers.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/21/2012 3:34:38 PM

Question: 1008: 0506 2; Bridge Drainage Pipe- Plans describe the bridge DRAINAGE pipe as DIP material. Plan and project notes also state that the Contractor is to submit signed and sealed drawings for the drainage system and materials and may also submit alternate drainage systems for approval. Can other pipe materials for this drainage system be utilized, specifically fiberglass, as an alternate to DIP pipe? Please clarify if fiberglass piping will be an accepted alternate for this system, and if other materials are also acceptable please provide a listing of those materials that also will be an acceptable alternate to the typically shown DIP piping.

Posted: 6/20/2012 1:50:46 PM

Answer: The plans specify the use of ductile iron pipe and the Contractor has the option of proposing an alternate drainage system for approval. It will be the Contractors responsibility to determine if an alternate system or material meets the Department's specifications. There will be no additional compensation if the bid is prepared with an alternate pipe material that is not accepted.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/21/2012 3:33:38 PM

Question: 1011: The quantity errors listed in Questions 771, 794, and 983 that were the basis for delaying the bid date were not revised on the new Expedite file available today. When will a new Expedite file be available for downloading?

Posted: 6/20/2012 10:50:02 AM

Answer: Plans Revision 1 has addressed bid questions 771, 794, and 983 and was posted today, June 21, 2012.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/21/2012 3:31:30 PM