



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 2/26/2014 10:16:01 AM

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

District Phone: (386) 943-5350

Proposal: T5486

Project: 238719-1-52-01

Letting Date: 2/26/2014

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 40

Question: 5815: (430,000 sq yd) Is there a reason why the District is using Performance Sod only in the contract bid items? There is a growing push to use performance turf, seed on most of the contracts (deisgn build)to save the county a lot of dollars. Sod should be used along the edges only (3 foot strips). Erosion Blankets like Curlex II that are 8 foot in width will work better to control Erosion than sod if that is the case.

Posted: 1/30/2014 10:43:06 AM

There should be a separate bid item for performance sod and performance seed in this upcoming bid. Also, there should be a bid item for Curlex II or equal erosion blankets (sq yd. cost). It will give the district more options than just sod.

Performance,Turf Sod Sq yd _____
Performance, Turf Seed Sq Yd _____
CurlexII Erosion Balnket Sq yd _____

Answer: The Department requires Performance Turf in this area. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 1/30/2014 1:19:11 PM

Question: 5818: Note 1 on plan sheet 113 and similar notes throughout the plans indicate that the Depatment posseses and/or knows of additional information on soil borings AND that bidders may obtain that information. The FDOT Geotechnical Department referanced in the note has not responded. Please provide all geotechnical information available OR provide details as to how this data can be acquired by bidders.

Posted: 1/30/2014 1:09:12 PM

Answer: The geotechnical reports are attached. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 1/30/2014 3:47:19 PM

Document: 2943001: J1399G2 SR 40 - Ponds 5 and 6-signed.pdf

J1399G2 SR 40 - Ponds 5 and 6

Document: 2943005: SR40_GeotechReport_02-23-11.pdf

SR40 GeotechReport

Question:	5950: Notes on the drawings refer to the existence geotechnical data that IS NOT ATTACHED to the bid package. 1. Are the notes wrong? 2. Is the Department in possession of geotechnical data that is being kept from the bidders?	Posted: 2/11/2014 11:31:44 AM
Answer:	The Department assumes that the question references the plan notes, "Boring locations shown outside of flowage easement R/W (or pond R/W limits) are for drainage purposes only. Information on these borings may be obtained from the FDOT Geotechnical Department." The response listed below is given with that assumption. Any other Geotechnical information has been uploaded to the bid question website under previously asked question #5818. The reports can be downloaded by going to question #5818 and clicking on show documents under the District Approved Answer. The documents will also be added to the bid documents prior to letting.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 2/17/2014 3:27:24 PM
Question:	5957: Please confirm the Optional Base Group desired for the special detours. The comp book calls for OBG 04 which is 6" of limerock , and sheet no 286 calls out for 4". Can you clarify?	Posted: 2/12/2014 8:15:40 AM
Answer:	The plan sheet #286, note #9 will be revised to list Optional Base Group 4. An addendum and plan sheet revision will be issued referencing the change.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 2/17/2014 3:25:28 PM
Question:	5961: Regarding Sheet 14, Note 13 How is this condition, if encountered, to be paid? Will this condition if encountered be considered a changed condition and paid by change order? How would the items like geogrid, fabric, clay, undercutting be paid for?	Posted: 2/12/2014 2:20:19 PM
Answer:	The Department assumes the question is referencing sheet 24, note 13 as sheet 14 contains no notes. The following response is based on that assumption. If encountered, the condition would be paid utilizing existing contract pay items where applicable. If the contract pay items do not cover the work required, payment would be applied using the Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction, section 4-3.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 2/17/2014 3:26:02 PM

Question: 5962: Regarding Sheet 15 notes, All excavation shall be considered as unsuitable for select material for bidding purposes

Posted: 2/12/2014 2:23:11 PM

Sheet 119 of the road soils survey states that stratum 1 and 2 shall be treated as select materials

Please clarify as to what is the intent of the note stating all material is deemed unsuitable when the borings show suitable material is present

Answer: The Department does not guarantee the details pertaining to borings, as shown in the Plans, to be more than a general indication of the materials likely to be found adjacent to holes bored at the site of the work, approximately at the locations indicated. Subsurface variations between borings should be anticipated as indicated in article 2-4 of the standard specifications for road and bridge construction. Due to the extreme variability of the subsurface profile and difficulties separating the soils, all of the excavation shall be considered as unusable for select fill materials for bid purposes.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/17/2014 3:12:32 PM

Question: 6025: We have found six locations in which minimum/maximum cover requirements per Index 205 seem to have been met for both HDPE Class II and Polypropylene Pipe. These locations include (S2-2 to S2-3), (S3-3 to S3-2), (S5-5 to S5-4), (S7-4 to S7-3), (S8-8 to S8-7) and (S9-2 to S9-1). We are asking for HDPE Class II / Polypropylene Pipe be approved as an optional material in these locations prior to the bid. This would allow the contractor community to bid accordingly.

Posted: 2/17/2014 5:07:22 PM

Answer: For the locations mentioned, HDPE Class II and Polypropylene Pipe do not meet the structural requirements and/or structural depth. The approved optional materials are noted in the plans.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/18/2014 1:39:41 PM