



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

5/5/2014 1:06:42 PM

District Address: District 1 Construction Office, located at 801 N Broadway, Bartow, FL 33830

District Phone: (863) 519-2222

Proposal: T1589

Project: 429498-1-52-01

Letting Date: 4/30/2014

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 555 (US 17)

Question: 6928: Regarding the pilaster construction for the installation of light pole 91, this installation is depicted on plan sheet 34. We have several questions.

Posted: 4/18/2014 1:36:16 PM

1. Is it the intent to remove only the outside pedestrian/bicycle parapet wall and a portion of the approach slab?
2. Confirm that we are to leave in place the existing traffic railing barrier.
3. Also, confirm that we are to leave in place and reuse the existing reinforcing steel in the approach slab.
4. Confirm that the new parapet wall does receive new reinforcing steel.

Answer: Revised Answers: Question 1. Is it the intent to remove only the outside pedestrian/bicycle parapet wall and a portion of the approach slab?
Answer 1. Yes. The existing pedestrian parapet and approach slab are to be removed to the limits shown on Plan Sheet 34. Question 2. Confirm that we are to leave in place the existing traffic railing barrier. Answer 2. The existing traffic railing barrier is to remain in place. Question 3. Also, confirm that we are to leave in place and reuse the existing reinforcing steel in the approach slab. Answer 3. No. Question 4. Confirm that the new parapet wall does receive new reinforcing steel. Answer 4. The new parapet wall shall require new reinforcing steel per the standard index.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 4/24/2014 5:08:16 PM

Answer:	Question 1. Is it the intent to remove only the outside pedestrian/bicycle parapet wall and a portion of the approach slab?	Status: ANSWER VOIDED
	Answer 1. Yes. The existing pedestrian parapet and approach slab are to be removed to the limits shown on Plan Sheet 34.	Posted: 4/22/2014 9:55:53 AM
	Question 2. Confirm that we are to leave in place the existing traffic railing barrier.	
	Answer 2. The existing traffic railing barrier shall remain in place.	
	Question 3. Also, confirm that we are to leave in place and reuse the existing reinforcing steel in the approach slab.	
	Answer 3. The existing approach slab reinforcing steel is to be left in place, cleaned and straightened for reuse in the approach slab pour.	
	Question 4. Confirm that the new parapet wall does receive new reinforcing steel.	
	Answer 4. The new parapet wall will require new reinforcing steel per the standard index. It is the intent that the existing parapet reinforcing will not be serviceable after demolition.	
Answer:	Revised Answers:	Status: ANSWER VOIDED
	Question 1. Is it the intent to remove only the outside pedestrian/bicycle parapet wall and a portion of the approach slab?	Posted: 4/24/2014 4:59:12 PM
	Answer 1. Yes. The existing pedestrian parapet and approach slab are to be removed to the limits shown on Plan Sheet 34.	
	Question 2. Confirm that we are to leave in place the existing traffic railing barrier.	
	Answer 2. The existing traffic railing barrier is to remain in place.	
	Question 3. Also, confirm that we are to leave in place and reuse the existing reinforcing steel in the approach slab.	
	Answer 3. No.	
	Question 4. Confirm that the new parapet wall does receive new reinforcing steel.	
	Answer 4. The new parapet wall shall require new reinforcing steel per the standard index.	
Answer:	Question 1. Is it the intent to remove only the outside pedestrian/bicycle parapet wall and a portion of the approach slab? Answer 1. Yes. The existing pedestrian parapet and approach slab are to be removed to the limits shown on Plan Sheet 34. Question 2. Confirm that we are to leave in place the existing traffic railing barrier. Answer 2. The existing traffic railing barrier shall remain in place. Question 3. Also, confirm that we are to leave in place and reuse the existing reinforcing steel in the approach slab. Answer 3. The existing approach slab reinforcing steel is to be left in place, cleaned and straightened for reuse in the approach slab pour. Question 4. Confirm that the new parapet wall does receive new reinforcing steel. Answer 4. The new parapet wall will require new reinforcing steel per the standard index. It is the intent that the existing parapet reinforcing will not be serviceable after 34.	Status: ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted: 4/24/2014 5:06:26 PM

Question: 6929: Regarding the installation of light poles 60, 62 & 64 as detailed on plan sheets 35, 36, 37 & 38. We have several questions. Posted: 4/18/2014 1:37:58 PM

1. Details show the removal of 30' of existing coping and sidewalk, centered on the light pole location. If the existing precast coping does not align with the end of the 30' removal, can the existing coping be saw cut and reinstalled to the 30' spot?
2. Confirm that the existing fence is to be reinstalled across these pole locations, with fence posts set in the concrete sidewalk/foundation pour.
3. Can you provide plans or details on the construction of the existing MSE walls?

Answer: Question 1. Details show the removal of 30' of existing coping and sidewalk, centered on the light pole location. If the existing precast coping does not align with the end of the 30' removal, can the existing coping be saw cut and reinstalled to the 30' spot? Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 4/22/2014 11:24:58 AM

Answer 1. If the centerline of a proposed light pole does not align with the centerline of an existing coping segment, it is permissible to shift the light pole location to make them align. It is preferred to not reinstall a partial precast coping segment.

Question 2. Confirm that the existing fence is to be reinstalled across these pole locations, with fence posts set in the concrete sidewalk/foundation pour.

Answer 2. The existing fence shall be reinstalled. The posts shall be poured into the proposed concrete pour for the sidewalk. The post shall be located at the back of walk to keep the existing fence alignment.

Question 3. Can you provide plans or details on the construction of the existing MSE walls?

Answer 3. Please copy and paste the following FTP site into your web browser. You will be taken to the FTP site where the plans shall be. Please click onto the plans and it will take a few minutes for the plans to open. This is a very large file. The original as-built plans may be downloaded at the following FTP Site:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/fdot/d1/Construction/Pre%20Bid%20Questions/>

Question: 6939: Is Railroad Protective Liability Insurance required for the work near the CSX track?
Per CSX Construction Submission Criteria the contractor must provide CSX a minimum of 25 TNs of CSXT Approved rail ballast; Will the contractor have to provide CSX with any ballast for this project? If so how much? Posted: 4/21/2014 7:41:58 PM

Answer: Revised Answer: Yes, this project does require a Flagman and Insurance as outlined in the Special provisions per 7-11.4.2 and as noted in the General Notes of the plans. CSX is aware of the project and work cannot proceed without this requirement. And there is no requirement for the contractor to provide ballast. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 4/23/2014 12:43:45 PM

Answer: There is no work on this project associated the railroad therefore No Railroad Protective Liability Insurance shall be required. Status: ANSWER VOIDED
Posted: 4/22/2014 1:21:51 PM

Question: 6971: The response to Question ID 6939 was that there is no work near the CSX track so no insurance will be required. Plan sheet 22 shows that the mow pads for poles 58 and 89 are adjacent to CSX's ROW , it will be impossible to build these without a slight encroachment into the ROW . Can the locations of these poles be moved to the south to avoid this? Posted: 4/22/2014 2:49:30 PM

Answer: The placement of the poles shall remain. The shape of the mow pad can be modified to avoid encroachment onto the CSX right of way. Per plan the lighting pull box will not be affected by the modification of the mow pad. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 4/24/2014 4:19:31 PM