



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 10/12/2012 10:32:51 AM

District Address: District 7 Construction Office, located at 11201 N McKinley, Tampa, FL 33612

District Phone: (813) 975-6285

Proposal: T7309

Project: 257147-1-52-01

Letting Date: 9/26/2012

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 688 (ULMERTON RD)

Question: 1362: Regarding the roadway work, 257147-1-52-01: Posted: 8/31/2012 10:02:34 AM

Note 13 on sheet 69 states that a signed and sealed letter by a Florida Professional Engineer affirming that in accordance with section 6-5.3 of the -- no materials containing asbestos were used in the construction of the project. Is this letter provided by the contractor or by others (FDOT or the CEI)? If to be provided by the Contractor, is it your expectation that the P.E. can rely on information provided by the contractor, or do you intend that the P.E. personally verify each bit of material used on the project? If the later, does that mean you anticipate full time inspection of all work by a P.E.? Can the assumption be made by the P.E. that all products on the QPL are asbestos free?

Answer: The note and signed and sealed letter is only in reference to a specific bridge structure - #150291 Ramp D over S.R. 688. This letter is to be signed and sealed by a Florida PE and provided by the contractor. The PE will need to determine the work effort necessary to provide the said signed and sealed statement. It should not be assumed that products on the QPL are asbestos free. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/10/2012 7:14:10 AM

Question: 1363: Regarding the Largo utility work, 257147-1-56-01: Posted: 8/31/2012 10:03:10 AM

Pay item 1060-11222 entitled "UTILITY STRUCTURE, BELOW GROUND, F&I, WATER / SEWER > 80 FT3, 6.1 - 12" appears to be incorrect. The only two manholes we can find in this project are shown on plan sheet U-8 and they have heights, rim to invert, of 5.8' and 5.67', which would mean they should be paid for under pay item 1060-11211 as they are both less than 6.1' deep and less than 80 FT3. Can you please correct the pay item so the bid makes sense?

Answer: Total depth of structures, with grout bench, will be approximately 6.1'. As there are no other structures included in the Largo utility work, current pay item number will remain unchanged. Unit prices should be appropriate for a typical 6' structure. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/7/2012 2:06:48 PM

Question:	1364: Regarding the Largo utility work, 257147-1-56-01: Why is the effluent line from the doghouse manhole at Sta. 1614+58, 56' RT called out as 18", shouldn't it be 8"?	Posted:	8/31/2012 10:03:48 AM
Answer:	Correct. The call-out to the effluent line from MH #5040 should read "Const. 6 LF 8" PVC San Swr." Pay item 1050 11224 includes pipe sizes from 8" to 19.9" and includes the quantity for this section of pipe. No change to pay items or quantities is required.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted:		Posted:	9/7/2012 2:06:18 PM
Question:	1365: Regarding the Largo utility work, 257147-1-56-01: What is the diameter of the existing manhole at Sta. 1313+42, 60' RT? Is there actually enough room on the manhole wall to install the new 18" gravity sewer by core drilling it between the existing 8" gravity sewer line, the existing 6" FM and the existing 16" FM? Unless this is a large diameter manhole or the FM enter at a different elevation than what is depicted on the plans, it would appear this manhole will require significant reconstruction and there will be an issue keeping the existing pipes functional until the new ones are in service. Please clarify if we are bidding on a simple core and plug scenario as called out on the plans or if we should anticipate having to rebuild the manhole and by pass the sewage while doing so and under what pay item we will be paid for this work. There is 1060 15 for "UTILITY STRUCTURE, BELOW GROUND, ADJUST/MODIFY", but that appears to be accounted for by the 6 MH rims to be adjusted.	Posted:	8/31/2012 10:06:23 AM
Answer:	The existing 16" FM is not active, and will not require bypass routing/pumping. The new 18" sewer is proposed to enter the manhole at the invert of the existing 16" FM; It was anticipated that the existing 16" FM penetration would be re-cored for the new 18" sewer. The existing 6" FM is shown to be removed from the existing MH #5030 and re-routed to the new MH #5035. If required for sequence of construction, it is acceptable to route the 6" FM to the new doghouse MH #5040 (Sta. 1614+58, 56' RT) instead. Bypass pumping/trucking is anticipated to be minimal; note that 2 vacuum trucks are to be included per Note 2 under "Special Construction Notes" on sheet U-2. All work to the existing MH #5030 shall be included in pay item 1060 15, distributing the costs between the remaining 5 manholes to be adjusted (rim & cover).	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted:		Posted:	9/7/2012 2:05:43 PM
Question:	1366: Regarding the Largo utility work, 257147-1-56-01: On plan sheet U-8, in association with "ENLARGED DETAIL 'A'" there is a note "STA. 1614+57, 60' RT 16" 45 BEND (DOWN)" that appears to be pointing to a fitting on the proposed 6" FM. Should this fitting be a 6" 45 instead of a 16" 45?	Posted:	8/31/2012 10:06:57 AM
Answer:	Yes. The callout should read "Sta. 1614+57, 60' RT 6" 45degree bend."	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted:		Posted:	9/7/2012 2:05:01 PM

Question: 1367: Regarding the Largo utility work, 257147-1-56-01: Posted: 8/31/2012 10:07:36 AM

The legend in the upper right corner of U-8 and the one in the lower left of U-9 both indicate that the pavement restoration and the mill/resurface work is to be included in the cost of the pipe. If that is correct, then where is the work that is to be included in pay items 0327 70 1 MILLING EXIST ASPH PAVT, 1" AVG DEPTH and 0337 7 45 ASPHALT CONCRETE FRICTION COURSE,TRAFFIC D, FC-12.5, PG 76-22?

Answer: ? Please disregard the notes in the legends on U-8 and U-9 directing the costs for pavement restoration and milling/resurfacing to be included in the cost of the pipe. Also, Technical Special Provision (TSP) Section 1050-FM, 4 Measurement and Payment, item #28 should read as follows: "All surface restoration in conformance with the details shown in these documents, except where specific Pay Items are provided." Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Paragraph 4.2 item #8 should read: "Backfilling and compacting the trench, including re-grading the terrain all necessary surface restoration, except where such work is specifically included in other Pay Items." Note that the quantities shown for Pay Items 0327 70 1 and 0337 745 include restoration/milling/resurfacing ONLY of pavement outside the limits/scope of restoration included in the roadway work 257147-1-52-01.

Posted: 9/7/2012 2:04:12 PM

Question: 1368: Regarding the Largo utility work, 257147-1-56-01: Posted: 8/31/2012 10:08:13 AM

On plan sheet U-9, you call for 6" C-900 Fusible PVC to be installed across all lanes of SR 688 during off-peak hours. The use of fusible PVC makes this task much more difficult than utilizing standard C-900 as we either must fuse this pipe in the hole or have the entire excavation available to install a fused piece across all lanes. We request that you either change this to a directional bore, where the fused PVC would have a tangible benefit, or switch to standard gasketed C-900 PVC to accommodate the reality of the traffic and fusing issues, which would far outweigh any perceived benefit of using fusible PVC.

Answer: The call-out for the crossing should read "Const. 6" C-900 Fusible PVC FM (See Note)"; open-cut installation is not specifically required. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Installation of jointed/gasketed pipe is not acceptable without a steel casing. Installation by directional drill is acceptable, provided approved plans for drilling and additional MOT. A minimum radius of pipe curvature no less than 2 times the manufacturer's minimum recommended bend radius shall be maintained. All other work and materials shall be in accordance with FDOT Standard Specification Section 555. Work within the ROW of 35th St. N and inside the Pinellas County R/W on the south side are acceptable - County permits have been obtained. However, no work is permitted on private property. Additional pipe outside the limits of the connection locations shown on the plans, as may be required for a directional drill path, shall not be included in pay quantities; additional pipe shall be dug up and connected as shown on the plans. All costs for the FM installation shall be included in Pay Item 1050 11223, distributed among the total quantity shown.

Posted: 9/7/2012 2:03:39 PM

Question: 1389: Can the comp books be made available? Posted: 9/4/2012 4:00:52 PM

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.
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/>

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/7/2012 2:02:45 PM

Question: 1392: Can the geotechnical reports be made available?
Posted: 9/4/2012 4:16:26 PM

Answer: The requested geotechnical reports are attached.
Posted: 9/10/2012 2:30:02 PM
Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Document: 1843788: 257147-1_GeotechReports.zip

Geotechnical Reports

Question: 1408: Can the comp books be made available?
Posted: 9/5/2012 11:51:08 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.
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/>

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/7/2012 2:02:21 PM

Question: 1431: Please provide the computation book
Posted: 9/6/2012 9:01:51 AM

Answer:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The computation book is available for download from your order history in online ordering.URL: https://www3.dot.state.fl.us/ContractProposalProcessingOnlineOrdering/</p>	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/7/2012 2:01:55 PM
Question:	<p>1470: On plan sheet 76, at 34th Street N. station 8+88.89, a note for the existing 53" X 83" ERCP says "REMOVE DBL PIPES END (SEE FLOWABLE FILL TABLE)". The eastern end of the 53" X 83" ERCP terminates in an existing swale. There is no defined end of the pipe to the west. The summary of flowable fill on plan sheet 52 indicates a length of 36 lf for this pipe. This seems low. Can you provide additional information or detail of the limits of the existing pipe to be removed or filled?</p>	Posted: 9/12/2012 10:10:25 AM
Answer:	<p>The existing twin 53"x83" pipes under 34th Street North are a remnants of an old drainage system that is no longer in use. The west end of this pipe was not surveyed. However, rough measurements by the designer indicate that the west end of the pipe is approximately 27' left of the NB baseline of construction. The Department desires to remove these pipes to the greatest extent practical. Sheet 76 has notes for the MES and pipe removal with a reference to the Flowable Fill Table. This table on sheet 52 indicates an estimated 36 foot (16.78' LT to 18.91 RT) length of the pipe to be placed out of service and filled with flowable fill. The estimate for limits of pipe removal are based upon assumed achievable excavation limits for each TCP phase.</p>	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/17/2012 1:27:32 PM
Question:	<p>1483: What is the Departments expectation regarding video inspection and laser profile for the new pipe being installed from a deflected connection to an existing pipe utilizing a concrete jacket to a concrete collar connection to a new pipe? (See S-108 and S-108A for typical examples.) It would appear access will be an issue.</p>	Posted: 9/13/2012 9:37:45 AM
Answer:	<p>Where access is practical, video inspection and laser profiling will be required for new pipe being installed from deflected connections to an existing pipe. As an example, it appears access to S-108 is impractical (the nearest structure is off the R/W). However in the case of S-108A it appears access is practical (available from the structure in the median).</p>	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/20/2012 1:48:17 PM
Question:	<p>1490: Regarding the storm, S-601 and S-605 are shown on the plans as U endwalls having 1:6 slopes. The only U endwall bid item description is for 1:4 slopes. Please clarify which you want.</p>	Posted: 9/14/2012 3:43:15 PM
Answer:	<p>The side slopes shown in the plans at S-601 and S-605 are correct at 1:6.</p>	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:29:59 AM

Question: 1492: S-100 on the plans appears as a MES 34"x53". There does not appear to be a bid item for this. Conversely, there is a bid item for a MES elliptical/arch 54" which equates to a 43" x 68" but we do not see any of these on the plans. Where do we bid the 34"x53" and where do we find the 54" elliptical/arch that we are bidding on?

Posted: 9/14/2012 4:09:07 PM

Answer: There is no 54" elliptical/arch pipe. The bid item for the 34"x53" MES is 430-982-642.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/21/2012 9:30:39 AM

Question: 1501: Question 1392 answer provides a GeotechReports.zip file attachment that we are unable to open or save to allow printing of the document. Can you correct this situation?

Posted: 9/17/2012 10:54:56 AM

Answer: The requested files have been uploaded individually to more easily facilitate downloading.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/20/2012 9:13:37 AM

Document: 1864985: 60%-Roadway_Rpt_wRevisedTable.pdf

60% Roadway Report

Document: 1864989: 257147-1 Bridge Dev Rt.pdf

Bridge Dev. Report

Document: 1865001: Boardwalk Report R2.pdf

Boardwalk Report R2

Document: 1865009: FinalGeotechReport_Boardwalk.pdf

Final Geotech Report - Boardwalk

Document: 1865012: FinalGeotechReport_MSEWalls.pdf

Final Geotech Report MSE Walls

Document: 1865013: FinalGeotechReport_RampD.pdf

Final GEOtech Report Ramps D

Document: 1865023: FinalGeotechReport_SheetPileWall.pdf

Final Geotech Report Sheetpile Wall

Document: 1865024: FinalGeotechReport_SignFoundations.pdf

Final Geotech Report Sign Foundations

Document: 1865026: FinalGeotechReport_StrainPoles.pdf

Final Geotech Report Strain Poles

Document: 1865034: H4075034 Sheet Pile Wall.pdf

H4075034 Sheet Pile Wall

Document: 1865041: Sign Report R1.pdf

Sign Report R1

Question: 1502: For Item 715-4-300, on sheet 47, the pay item note states to include \$80,000 for Progress Energy to install joint use lighting. Is that the entire extent of the pay item? In other words, every contractor should bid this item at \$80,000. Posted: 9/17/2012 11:20:32 AM

Answer: Each bidder should include \$80,000 for Item 715-4-300 in the bid. This amount will be used for the contractor to directly reimburse Progress Energy for installation of joint use lighting. Nothing else is included in this item. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/21/2012 9:31:33 AM

Question: 1503: S-210 is identified on plan sheet 174 as a 36" Index 282 Endwall. Index 282, to the best of our knowledge, only goes up to 24". Can you please point out where we can find or get a detail of the 36" Index Endwall? (We were unable to locate one in the plans.) As the Riprap is incidental it is important that the detail include the riprap quantity as well as the concrete. Posted: 9/17/2012 11:36:24 AM

Answer:	Index 250 (36") detail should be utilized for construction of the S-210 endwall. 3.3 SY of concrete ditch pavement has been included in lieu of riprap at this location.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:32:19 AM
Question:	1504: How is the colored concrete curb specified in various locations to be paid.	Posted: 9/17/2012 12:55:35 PM
Answer:	Pay Item Note for 520-1-1 & 520-2-X on sheet 47 states that "all curb & gutter and curb along the right outside of SR 688 from Sta 1664+65 to Sta 1701+36 shall utilize concrete with "Carillon Pink" color." The cost of utilizing colored concrete in these select areas should be included in these pay item numbers.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:33:07 AM
Question:	1505: How are all the skimmers shown on sheet 203 of the plans to be paid?	Posted: 9/17/2012 12:57:36 PM
Answer:	Pay item notes for 400-2-11, 425-1-5XX and 425-11 on sheet 47 include the cost of the skimmers, concrete pads and accessories.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:33:46 AM
Question:	1506: Sheet 204 references a summary of quantities for Tabulation of Bus Stops by location and type. I do not find this summary.	Posted: 9/17/2012 12:59:36 PM
Answer:	The "Tabulation of Bus Stops" was removed from the final plans. The note on sheet 204 referring to the table should be disregarded.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:34:30 AM
Question:	1507: Please better explain not 30 on sheet 411. Is the 20 hours cumulative over the period of a week over the life of the detour?	Posted: 9/17/2012 1:01:51 PM
Answer:	Note 30 refers to the temporary traffic "diversions" detailed in the plans to allow for overhead work to remove the existing bridge and build the new. The detour shown on sheet 419 is a long term detour for the closure of existing Ramp C. Note 30 does not apply to the Ramp C detour. The 20 cumulative hours are intended to be over the life of the diversion and can be adjusted by the engineer.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:35:21 AM
Question:	1508: Can pump stations or valves be shut down on the force main or gravity connections? Will by-pass pumping be required at any of the force main or gravity connection and if so please provide flow rates.	Posted: 9/17/2012 1:07:12 PM

Answer:	The 16" FM is currently off-line, valved off at 34th Street. The 6" FM carries flow from 2 private pump stations north of Ulmerton Rd., with pump flows of approximately 50 gpm and 250 gpm, respectively. The 2" FM carries flow from 2 private pump stations south of Ulmerton Rd., with pump flows of approximately 20 gpm each. Temporary shutdown of pump stations will be required for connection to the existing 2" FM and 6" FM. Isolation valves are only available at the stations themselves. Durations of the shutdowns are limited to the capacity of the private systems. All connections shall be made during off-peak hours (night-time). All force main and pump station shut-downs shall be coordinated, a minimum of 2 days in advance, with City of Largo Environmental Services (re: POCTS). Bypass pumps should not be required at connections, but the Contractor shall include vacuum truck services in accordance with Note 2 under "Special Construction" on U-2, to service the pump stations during temporary shut-down and/or clean drainage at connection points.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:35:54 AM
Question:	1509: How is 8" DIP and flex connectors in conflict structures to be paid?	Posted: 9/17/2012 1:08:12 PM
Answer:	Pay item note 1050-11-424 on sheet 47 includes the cost of the flexible adapters for pipe joints.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:36:29 AM
Question:	1510: With respect to the off duty officers, Specification note 102-7 on page 88 and plan note 40 on sheet 412 differ on what is to be covered. Which prevails?	Posted: 9/17/2012 1:10:43 PM
Answer:	Page 88 of the Specifications Package is the "Supplemental Specification" for Section 102 Maintenance of Traffic. Plan notes override Supplemental Specifications.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:36:59 AM
Question:	1511: With respect to Clearing and Grubbing, It appears that some of the clearing limits shown in the computation book and on plan sheets include trees that are partially in or protrude from Jurisdictional Wetlands. Does this mean that hand selective clearing with non-mechanical means will be required?	Posted: 9/17/2012 1:14:46 PM
Answer:	There are permitted impacts to the wetlands that will require clearing and grubbing for construction within the jurisdictional wetlands. These impacts are covered by the permit. There are other areas where vegetation growing from within jurisdictional wetlands overhangs required grading areas. Vegetation other than mangroves can be removed at will outside of the jurisdictional lines to facilitate access to these areas. Any required trimming of mangroves outside of permitted wetland impacts must be performed in accordance with the Pinellas County Mangrove Trimming and Preservation Code.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/21/2012 9:37:35 AM

Question:	1523: Bid documents call for the following pay item #544-75-140 Crash Cushion - Optional, Less Than 50. However, in the plans (sheet 79) Crash Cushion (Quadguard) is called out. Is it the department's intent to have the Quadguard brand installed, or can the contractor utilize an optional manufacturer?	Posted:	9/17/2012 4:25:57 PM
Answer:	There are currently no valid pay items for proprietary crash cushions. The -140 (Optional) is currently the only valid pay item. The designer is however allowed to limit the crash cushion options within the plans. Quadguard is the only permanent crash cushion option allowed for this project.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/21/2012 9:38:01 AM
Question:	1549: On drawing B1-2 note 1 states "the existing piles shall be completely removed". Please clarify if this note is meant to remove the piles from their tip to top of pile or is it meant to remove the piles to 2 ft below the finish ground line per 110-6.2.1	Posted:	9/18/2012 1:38:46 PM
Answer:	FDOT Specifications 110-6.2.1 requires pilings to be pulled, cut off or broken off to the requirements of the permit or other Contract Documents, whichever requires the deepest removal, but not less than 2 feet below the finish ground line. The piles should be removed from their tip to the top of the pile as indicated in Note 1 on Sheet B1-2 of the Contract Plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/21/2012 9:38:46 AM
Question:	1557: The existing concrete turnouts that are being removed, will they be replaced with asphalt or concrete?	Posted:	9/18/2012 5:15:16 PM
Answer:	Concrete turnouts are only required for replacement of existing concrete driveways located at Sta 1612+12.62 RT, 1613+01.10 RT, and at Sta 6+77.98 RT (38th Street N).	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/21/2012 9:39:16 AM
Question:	1569: Pay item note 110-86 states that the contractor shall deliver all asphalt millings and non-reinforced concrete to FDOT's Ulmerton Road yard. Please clarify what milling are to be delivered. Does this include the milling pay item work as well as the demo milling associated with the clear and grub? Will the contractor have use of the millings as commercial material or temporary base before delivery to FDOT?	Posted:	9/19/2012 10:03:16 AM
Answer:	Only 100 tons of asphalt millings from this project will need to be delivered to FDOT designated facility. This material can either be from the milling pay item work or the demo milling associated with the clearing and grubbing. The remainder of the milled material including the non-reinforced concrete will become the property of the Contractor.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
	The Contractor is to contact Abu Nazmurreza, at Pinellas Maintenance (727-570-5101, Monday thru Thursday 7:00 a.m. - 5:30 pm.) at least seven days prior to removal operations to coordinate delivery of salvaged materials to the Roosevelt Pit located at 11700 Roosevelt Blvd.	Posted:	9/20/2012 9:59:58 AM

Question: 1574: What is the pavement section for the temporary pavement?
(subgrade/base/asphalt types and thicknesses) Posted: 9/19/2012 12:10:05 PM

Answer: The composition of the temporary pavement section is at the discretion of the contractor. The riding surface must be placed per note 17 on sheet 411 and maintained per Section 102-5.2 of the specifications. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/21/2012 11:40:21 AM

Question: 1581: What are the quantities for the overbuild sections? Posted: 9/19/2012 2:43:20 PM

Answer: The overbuild quantities are detailed in the Computation Book which has been made available to all bidders. Please see the previous bid question responses regarding how to obtain the project compbook. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/21/2012 11:39:48 AM

Question: 1595: The traffic diversion as a sub-phase during phase three restricts traffic to one lane each direction. Are there any limitations as to the amount of time that this diversion will be kept in place? Is it to be removed daily? Does it follow the same restrictions as a detour (Note 30, TCP General Notes.) Please clarify. Posted: 9/20/2012 2:23:27 PM

Answer: The time restrictions outlined in Note 30 on sheet 411 are applicable to the temporary traffic "diversions". The diversions are limited to nighttime operations only and are subject to the project lane closure restrictions. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/21/2012 11:39:25 AM