



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

12/3/2014 8:42:42 AM

District Address: District 6 Construction Office, located at 1000 NW 111 Ave, Miami, FL 33172

District Phone: (305) 640-7448

Proposal: T6220

Project: 249614-3-52-01

Letting Date: 12/3/2014

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 997 (KROME AVE)

Question: 8527: Please clarify the following: Posted: 11/12/2014 10:05:36 AM

Section T120 Surcharge Embankment requires the first 12" lift shall have a LBR with a minimum 126. We assume that you want sufficient LBR in this lower layer of the surcharge as it may subside down within the subgrade level of the roadway template up to 6" according to the specification. However, the stabilized subgrade zone of the profile only requires a LBR with a minimum of 40 per sheet No. 6 and the subsequent limerock base section has a LBR requirement with a minimum of 100 per section 911.

Since according to the plans the entire surcharge is to be later removed to top of subbase and limerock base will be later constructed above this layer, please clarify the need for this stringent specification as it may greatly limit the sources for this material.

Answer: The plans require that the sub-grade embankment material shall have a minimum LBR 126 and the stabilized portion of this embankment meet a minimum 'bearing value' of LBR 40, as per FDOT Specifications Section 160-4. Due to anticipated settlement, the material within the entire depth of 4-ft. below the proposed bottom of base elevation shall meet the minimum LBR 126. However, the first 12" of the surcharge above the bottom of the base may have an LBR value of less than 126, provided that the material is SELECT and will attain a minimum bearing value of LBR 40 if it is anticipated to constitute part of the stabilized subgrade. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/19/2014 3:08:26 PM

Answer: The plans require subgrade with minimum LBR 40 and embankment material shall have minimum LBR 126. Due to anticipated settlement, all four feet below base shall be constructed with LBR 126; however, the first 12" of the surcharge above bottom of base shall have minimum LBR 40, so it may have LBR less than 126. Status: ANSWER VOIDED

Posted: 11/19/2014 11:27:36 AM

Question: 8528: The "Optional Materials Tabulation" for Drainage Pipe includes HDPE Class II but does not include Polypropylene Pipe as an acceptable material. Polypropylene Pipe is now approved for 100 year DSL applications. We are asking for Polypropylene Pipe to be allowed/included as an optional pipe material (as long as min/max cover requirements are met). Posted: 11/12/2014 11:06:12 AM

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Answer: | Polypropylene Pipe cannot be used on this project. The exiting soil condition is too aggressive for this material, and the service life could not be achieved. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 11/17/2014 1:31:32 PM |
| Question: | 8584: Does the perforated pipe inside the French Drain system require the D-3 joint wrap? | Posted: 11/17/2014 3:39:25 PM |
| Answer: | The perforated pipe inside the French Drain system does not require the D-3 joint wrap. Refer to Index 285 of the Design Standards for French Drain construction. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 11/19/2014 2:39:52 PM |
| Question: | 8598: The earthwork quantities on the Summary of Pay Items sheets do not appear to agree with the Summary of Earthwork table (Sheet 13.) The quantity totals in the table on sheet 310 (cross sections) seem to differ as well. Could you please explain this difference or clarify the accurate earthwork quantities. | Posted: 11/18/2014 2:55:25 PM |
| Answer: | 1.- The Quantities in THE SUMMARY OF Pay Item sheets are correct. 2.- The Quantity for SURCHARGE (120-74) in the SUMMARY OF EARTHWORK TABLE in sheet 13 should be 699,050 CY instead of 903,050 CY. 3.- In the table on sheet 310, the Quantity for SUBSOIL EXCAVATION (120-4) for Krome Avenue should be 234,319 CY to match the quantity shown in total column in sheet 288; therefore, the GRAND TOTAL should be 246,971 CY instead of 243,253 CY. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 11/19/2014 2:34:42 PM |
| Question: | 8600: There appears to be more temporary pavement than is reflected in pay item 334-1-11 (Superpave, Traffic A.) Could you please verify that this quantity is accurate? | Posted: 11/18/2014 2:59:27 PM |
| Answer: | If necessary, the Pay Item 331-1-11 quantities will be overrun as approved by the Engineer. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 11/21/2014 12:36:24 PM |
| Question: | 8609: In the plans you show there being 6" white preformed lines but there is no pay item for this. Same for the preformed 6" skip lines, there are no pay items for these. Can you revise these items so they are in the pay items? Also you show 3'-9' thermo skip lines for the bike trail, are you sure you don't want this in paint? | Posted: 11/19/2014 10:20:10 AM |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| Answer: | Pay Items 711-16-111 and 711-16-131 - (Thermoplastic, Standard-Other Surfaces) include the payment for pavement longitudinal markings to be placed on dense graded asphalt or concrete surfaces. It is the intent of the design to place thermoplastic, preformed markings on the concrete surface and to be paid under these pay items. Also, it is the intent of the design to place thermoplastic 3'-9" skip lines for the bike trail as shown in the plans. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/20/2014 11:08:12 AM |
| Question: | 8620: 1)Sheet 26, Excavation/Embankment/Surcharge: Note 7. "All excavation Material is unsuitable for backfill. The cost of disposal shall be included under the corresponding pay item." - Please clarify, Does this note apply to all material, ie. New embankment material excavated for placement of utilities, native material, Item 0120 1 Regular Excavation Material? | Posted: 11/19/2014 5:05:20 PM |
| Answer: | Excavated material can be used for backfilling as specified in Article 120-7 of the Standard Specifications. However, for purposed of the bidding the Contractor shall assume that all regular and subsoil excavated material will be contaminated with organic material and unsuitable for backfilling. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/20/2014 10:11:18 AM |
| Question: | 8621: Will existing A-2-4, A-1-a, A-1-b material, excavated as subsoil excavation, be allowed to be used as embankment material on this project? | Posted: 11/19/2014 5:06:32 PM |
| Answer: | Excavated material can be used for backfilling as specified in Article 120-7 of the Standard Specifications. However, for purposed of the bidding the Contractor shall assume that all material, excavated as subsoil or regular excavation, will be contaminated with organic material and unsuitable for backfilling. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/20/2014 10:16:06 AM |
| Question: | 8622: Will Regular Excavation material be allowed to be used as embankment? | Posted: 11/19/2014 5:07:26 PM |
| Answer: | Excavated material can be used for backfilling as specified in Article 120-7 of the Standard Specifications. However, for purposed of the bidding the Contractor shall assume that all material, excavated as subsoil or regular excavation, will be contaminated with organic material and unsuitable for backfilling. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/20/2014 10:17:22 AM |
| Question: | 8623: Please provide the project CAD drawings be provided to bidders? | Posted: 11/19/2014 5:08:14 PM |
| Answer: | The T6220 CADD files have been uploaded to the CPP Online Ordering System. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/24/2014 11:45:27 AM |

Question: 8624: Specification Section T120, A. "A summary of the surcharge location-> is presented below:"
Will the entire area presented as surcharge location require the placement of Surcharge embankment? Posted: 11/19/2014 5:08:56 PM

Answer: The limits of surcharge are shown on phases II and III of the Traffic Control Plans and on sheet 314. Also, refer to TSP120 for longitudinal limits.
Only those limits identified in plan sheets require surcharge embankment. These limits correspond to those shown on TSP120 Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 11/20/2014 5:36:14 PM

Question: 8633: Supplemental Specification 8-13.1, "Incentive - Disincentive for A+B", provides the process and details for for incentive payments and disincentive deductions for "A+B" projects. Supplemental Specification 8-13.2, "Incentive-> Disincentive" also provides for incentive payments and disincentive deductions but does not appear to apply to "A+B" contracts and, therefore, does not appear to apply to this Contract. Will FDOT confirm that Supplemental Specification 8-13.2 does not apply to this Contract? Posted: 11/20/2014 1:58:53 PM

Answer: Both incentive-disincentive provisions defined in the Special Provisions apply to this Contract: Subarticle 8-13.1 (revised in the Supplemental Package One) "Incentive - Disincentive for A+B" and Subarticle 8-13.1 "Incentive - Disincentive". If the Contractor completes Contract prior to expiration of the Original Contract Time, the Department will pay incentives in the Daily Value of \$15,000 for up to 15 days (\$225,000) and \$25,000 for up to 50 days (\$1,250,000) the actual completion date precedes the Original Contract Time as defined in the specifications. For example, if the Contractor finishes 50 days expiration of the Original Contract Time, the Department will pay the maximum allowed incentive amount on this Contract \$1,475,000. In case the Contractor fails to timely complete the Contract, deductions in similar amounts shall be the disincentive as defined in the specifications. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 11/20/2014 5:22:03 PM

Question: 8635: Special Provision 2-5.1 provides that the bidder establishes the number of calendar days necessary to complete the work. The Bid Solicitation Notice provides that maximum number of days allowed for the Project is 1200 days. However, Special Provision 3-2.3 for A+B Bidding provides that "For this Contract, the Department will reject any bid in which the bidder submits proposed Contract time in excess of 15 calendar days." Posted: 11/20/2014 3:01:54 PM

However, the subsequently issued Supplemental Specification 3-2.3 for A+B Bidding contradicts this by stating that "the Department will reject any bid in which the bidder submits proposed Contract time in excess of 1200 calendar days." The instructions in Supplemental Specification 3-2.3, however, do not state to delete the prior version of 3-2.3 in the Special Provisions, and the Special Provisions take precedence over Supplemental Provisions (see Standard Specification 5-2).

Please clarify the maximum number of days that will be accepted in a bid.

| | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| Answer: | Provisions of the Supplemental Specification Package Number One govern over provisions of the Specification Package. Therefore, as stated in Article 3-2.3 of the Supplemental Specification Package Number One, "the Department will reject any bid in which the bidder submits proposed Contract time in excess of 1200 calendar days". | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/20/2014 5:31:07 PM |
| Question: | 8636: Reference Plan Sheet 26, Excavation/Embankment/Surcharge Note 2. The note states that "no additional compensation shall be included for excavation below the 4' cut line". There is a possibility of unsuitable material remaining at the bottom of the excavation. In addition, there are some cases where the bottom of the excavation will be below the water table. Upon inspection, will the Department require the Contractor to remove the unsuitable material below the 4' cut line? If so, how will this excavation be paid? | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:06:43 PM |
| Answer: | The Department will not require the Contractor to remove the unsuitable material below the 4' cut line. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/20/2014 5:41:02 PM |
| Question: | 8637: Reference Plan Sheet 189, Cross Sections. Cross Sections from approximately Station 2000+00 North to the SR 90 intersection indicate that the Subsoil Excavation tapering to nothing west of the existing road and within the 2:1 influence lines from Southbound left shoulder. Upon inspection, will the Department require additional Subsoil Excavation in similar areas is warranted or will the Contractor be allowed to thicken their lifts to bridge any unsuitable subgrade areas? If so, under what pay item will this work be paid? | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:08:27 PM |
| Answer: | The Department will not require additional subsoil excavation beyond limits shown on the cross section. The Contractor will not be allowed to thicken the lifts to bridge unsuitable material. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/21/2014 10:24:55 AM |
| Question: | 8638: Reference Plan Sheet 191, Cross Sections. Will the Contractor be required to remove silt from the bottom of the existing ditch located under the Northbound lane prior to placing embankment? If so, under what pay item will this work be paid? | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:09:56 PM |
| Answer: | As shown on Sheet 76 and cross-sections, embankment within 4' below base is replaced with LBR 126 material. Muck and silt outside of limits of LBR 126 embankment shall remain and will be compacted by surcharge. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/21/2014 11:23:35 AM |
| Question: | 8639: Reference Plan Sheet 101, Drainage Structures. Upon inspection, will the Contractor be required to remove unsuitable material from the bottom of pipe and structure excavations that was not included in the Subsoil Excavation limits? If so, under what pay item will this work be paid? | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:12:12 PM |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| Answer: | Unsuitable material within the foundation for pipes and structures shall be removed in accordance with Articles 425-6 and 430-4 of the Standard Specifications. Cost of all excavation for pipes and structures is included in the related drainage bid items, except volume included in separate pay items. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/21/2014 12:02:37 PM |
| Question: | 8640: Reference Traffic Control Plans, Sheet No. 318, Phase 2, 2A, 2B, from STA 1993+00.00 to STA 2205+00.00 states: "Construct NB portion of SR 997/Krome Ave, construct temporary widening, and mill and resurface and overbuild as shown in the roadway plans up to the structural asphalt course". Based on the proposed cross sections, there are some areas in this segment that have a conflict between the West side slope of the NB embankment and the existing road. Please clarify if it is FDOT's intention to temporarily widen the existing road on the West side during these phases. | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:14:28 PM |
| Answer: | It is not the Department's intention to temporarily widen the existing road on the West side during these phases. The Contractor may use embankment slopes steeper than 1:6, but not steeper than 1:2 to avoid conflict with existing roadway. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/21/2014 11:44:05 AM |
| Question: | 8641: Reference TCP Sheet No. 306-307 and No. 399-400. In the Traffic Control Plans (TCP), stations 2008+00 to 2187+00 (17,900 linear feet) are missing from all the phases. The quantities for painted pavement markings, temporary barrier wall (F&I and relocate), etc. showed in the Project Summary of Pay Items sheets and in the Computation Book take into account those stations. Do we assume that the missing portion is a typical section (like that shown in sheet no. 366 of the TCP)? | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:16:27 PM |
| Answer: | These stations were left out of the TCP phase since they were typical / repetitive sheets. Items of work for those sheets are quantified in plans and Computation Book. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/21/2014 11:29:34 AM |
| Question: | 8642: Reference Plan Sheet 76, Roadway Details. Detail N shows a special Subsoil Excavation limit that considers the elevation for the existing force mains that are to remain in place. Will the Contractor be required to protect the existing watermains and forcemains during the Surcharging and Settlement activities to prevent potential damages associated with settlement? | Posted: 11/20/2014 3:17:50 PM |
| Answer: | Contractor responsibilities for existing water mains and force mains are outlined in the plans, the Utility Work Schedule from Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department and Section 7 of the Standard Specifications. | Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: 11/21/2014 11:24:44 AM |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|---------|------------------------|
| Question: | 8643: Reference T120-3 Settlement Monitoring. Paragraph D states, "Surcharge load shall be maintained for at least 12 weeks after completion of the surcharge fill placement." Will the Contractor be allowed to remove the surcharge prior to the required 12 weeks if the settlement rate is less than 0.1 inch for at least a month? Are there any conditions that would allow the Contractor to remove the surcharge early? | Posted: | 11/20/2014 3:25:35 PM |
| Answer: | As stated in Section D, Article T120-3 of the Technical Special Provisions for Surcharge Embankment, "the settlement period can be considered complete once the surcharge is maintained for at least 12 weeks and the rate of settlement is less than 0.1 inch for at least one month". Therefore, both conditions shall be satisfied. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 11/21/2014 10:49:12 AM |
| Question: | 8671: Through the issuance of several addendums, there has been a substantial increase in the lighting scope that includes 259 light poles that require 30" x 26' deep cylindrical foundations as well as the addition of 57,535 LF of directional bores among other items. Please clarify if the overall total budget for the project has been increased due to these significant changes. | Posted: | 11/25/2014 3:24:19 PM |
| Answer: | Yes, the budget amount will be increased due to these changes. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 11/25/2014 4:57:24 PM |
| Question: | 8673: The Technical Special Provision for this project states that only 5 feet of surcharge will be paid (distance between the top of the surcharge and the Roadway Template), but on page 314, Traffic Control Plan, the Typical Section shows more than 5 feet of surcharge Material to be placed (it shows more or less 18 additional inches of material, limits are from top of surcharge to bottom of base material "top of Stabilization"). Please clarify how will the contractor get paid for this additional work/material? | Posted: | 11/25/2014 4:54:19 PM |
| Answer: | According to Article T120-4 of the Technical Special Provision for Surcharge Embankment, "measurement shall include only surcharge material actually placed above the road template" (above bottom of the base). According to Article T120-1 Surcharge height is "5 feet above Profile Grade Line (PGL)". Therefore, limits of the surcharge on Sheet 314 are shown correctly. Quantities were calculated using the limits stated above. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 11/26/2014 12:47:42 PM |
| Question: | 8674: Pursuant to review of the provided cross section it's apparent that there is approximately 400-lf of an existing Sewer Main, but stationing (Sta 1975+00 to Sta 2201+00) shows 22,600-lf. Please specify if this is correct. Do you anticipate to have said main under pressure during the progression of the work? We are cognizant that we must protect the main during the work but need to assess any potential risks associated with the surrounding work. | Posted: | 11/25/2014 4:55:19 PM |

Answer: The 30" Sewer Main starts at approximately Sta. 1975+00 and extends to Sta. 2201+00 for a total of 22,600-lf. From that point on there is another 16" Sewer Main which extends up to Sta. 2222+00 for a total of 2100-lf, and both sewer mains will be under pressure (OPERATIONAL) during the progression of the work.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/26/2014 9:22:38 AM

Question: 8678: the quantities for item 711-15-131 and item 711-16-231 don't seem to correspond to the length of the project. are these correct?

Posted: 11/26/2014 9:51:26 AM

Answer: The quantities for Pay item 711-15-131 and pay item 711-16-231 are incorrect. The actual quantities will be significantly lower. The Contractor shall anticipate reduction in quantities of work for these Pay Items.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/26/2014 2:14:19 PM