Bid Questions and Answers Report  Date & Time: 4/29/2015 2:21:27 PM

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

District Phone: (305) 640-7448

Proposal: T6394

Project: 249615-7-52-01

Letting Date: 4/29/2015

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 997(KROME AVE) (NW 177TH AVE)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Question: | 9565: In review of Lighting Plan Sheet No. L-12 at Sta 365+40 LFT it shows that the conductors located in the 2" Conduit should be 2 #2, but then on Sheet No. L-13 it shows 2 #6 & 1 #6 GRD. Can you clarify if this is the correct detail. If so, please provide detail as to the cutoff point of the 2 #2 conductors. | Posted: | 3/31/2015 4:54:53 PM |
| Answer: | The 2#2 is in a different conduit than the 2#6 & 1#6 GRD. The conduit for the 2#2 is for the FPL service drop to the service panel. The 2#6 & 1#6 GRD is for the street lighting circuit in a conduit from the street lighting panel. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/1/2015 5:09:00 PM |
| Question: | 9566: The Contract Admin Letting site shows that Addendum 1 was issued on March 30th, but it does not appear in the CPP Online Ordering site. Please post addendum so that it can be downloaded. | Posted: | 4/1/2015 8:34:01 AM |
| Answer: | The Addendum and Amendment files have been posted to the CPP Online Ordering system. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/1/2015 5:05:04 PM |
| Question: | 9615: Based on information provided by the manufacturers of the delineators, the "Yellow Reflective Sheeting Type V" is a non-typical reflective sheeting. Therefore, this material would have to be specifically produced for the project and would require a significant waiting period. Could a typical "White Reflective Sheeting Class V" be utilized instead of the yellow? | Posted: | 4/3/2015 12:30:12 PM |
| Answer: | Please provide yellow reflective sheeting class V as specified in the contract documents. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/3/2015 3:29:25 PM |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Question: | 9676: In the new Typical Section Details; Sheet No. 9 as provided in Addendum No. 1 it details that the LBR 126 will be installed 48-in below bottom of stabilization. Upon review of the plans it has come to our attention that the LBR 126 will be installed in the water table. This will require the Contractor to de-water in order to place and compact the LBR 126 material. Will the Department allow the usage of A-3 Material to be placed "in the wet" and then place and compact the LBR 126? | Posted: | 4/7/2015 11:59:55 AM |
| Answer: | LBR 126 material shall be installed 48" below the bottom of the base, not stabilized subgrade. A-3 material will not be allowed in lieu of LBR 126 material. Density testing requirements do not apply to material placed "in the wet". | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/17/2015 10:37:23 AM |
| Question: | 9677: In the new Typical Section Details; Sheet No. 9 as provided in Addendum No. 1 it details that the LBR 126 will be installed 48-in below bottom of stabilization. Upon review of the plans it has come to our attention that the LBR 126 will be installed in the water table. This will require the Contractor to de-water in order to place and compact the LBR 126 material. Will the Department allow the usage of A-3 Material to be placed "in the wet" and then place and compact the LBR 126? | Posted: | 4/7/2015 12:05:27 PM |
| Answer: | LBR 126 material shall be installed 48" below bottom of the base, not below stabilized subgrade. A-3 material will not be allowed in lieu of LBR 126 material. Density testing requirements do not apply to material placed "in the wet". | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/17/2015 10:33:51 AM |
| Question: | 9678: Drainage structure S-327 and S-350 are called out as Gutter Inlet Type S and provide an index reference of 200, 201, and 230. Standard index 230 applies to "Ditch Bottom Inlet -Type A" which contradicts the call out "Gutter Inlet Type S". Please clarify index reference or call out. | Posted: | 4/7/2015 12:05:45 PM |
| Answer: | S-327 and S-350 are both Type S as shown and quantified. Please refer to appropriate index. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/7/2015 2:47:08 PM |
| Question: | 9679: It has come to our attention that Phase II will not be completed in its entirety. Upon review of the Special Detours we noticed that the beginning of each detour will not allow the Contractor to reconstruct the Existing Krome Ave after the detour has been implemented. Here are the approximate quantities for each detour. Special Detour 1: 1,216.89-sy (608.44-sy per location) and Special Detour 2: will have a total of 3,469.78-sy (1,734.89-sy per location). These areas will have constant traffic on it and not allow the Contractor to reconstruct "Existing Krome Ave." Will the Department allow for the Contractor to move the Special Detours either up or back in order to construct these areas? | Posted: | 4/7/2015 12:06:03 PM |
| Answer: | These detours are to be used and adjusted as needed. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/7/2015 2:48:27 PM |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Question: | 9770: Will the Department allow the Contractor to install A3 material in lieu of LBR 126 if the Contractor would encounter the water table? Using this method alleviates the necessity to install well points during the Embankment work. | Posted: | 4/13/2015 5:44:37 PM |
| Answer: | A-3 material will not be allowed in lieu of LBR 126 material. Density testing requirements do not apply to material placed in the wet. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/17/2015 10:43:03 AM |
| Question: | 9930: Pursuant to Sheet 15, Note 8, Arsenic has been identified in the soil throughout the corridor. The note indicates that the Arsenic levels are below the "commercial/industrial cleanup target level". The note also alludes to a "Impact to Construction Assesment (ICA)" as the source for this information. Please provide a copy of said ICA report via addendum. | Posted: | 4/22/2015 1:30:28 PM |
| Answer: | Open attachment to this response to see the report. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/22/2015 4:48:33 PM |

| | |
|---|---|
| Document: | 3967567: Krome Project ICA Final 4-22-15 (1).pdf<br><br>249615-7 - ICA Report |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Question: | 9931: Sheet 15, Note 8 indicates that the District Contamination Impact Coordinator has information regarding the Departments proposed soil reuse of the A-8 material tainted with arsenic. Please provide a copy of the documentation for this proposed reuse of A-8 material via addendum. | Posted: | 4/22/2015 1:31:08 PM |
| Answer: | ICA Report is attached to response to Question 9930. | Status:<br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br>4/22/2015 4:51:08 PM |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Question: | 9932: Pursuant to Sheet 15, Note 8, A-8 material containing arsenic may found in the corridor, and that "the sampling, testing, transportation and disposal or reuse of the A-8 material shall be included in Pay Item 120-4 - Subsoil Excavation".<br><br>Pursuant to FDOT Specification 120-1.2 (July 2015) in the event that contaminated materials are discovered during excavation "The Engineer will notify the District Contamination Impact Coordinator (DCIC) who will coordinate selecting and tasking the Department's Contamination Assessment/Remediation Contractor (CAR)" and further that "The CAR Contractor will delineate the contamination areas, any staging or holding area required; and, in cooperation with the Prime Contractor and Engineer, develop a work plan that will provide the CAR Contractor's operations schedule with projected completion dates for the final resolution of the contamination issue".<br><br>Please confirm that this spec applies to arsenic tainted A-8 materials within the corridor. | Posted: | 4/22/2015 1:38:16 PM |
| Answer: | These Specification provisions do not apply to arsenic tainted A-8 material within the corridor. As stated in the referenced note, the Contractor will be responsible for "the sampling, testing, transportation and disposal or reuse of the A-8 material". | Status:<br><br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br><br>4/22/2015 5:01:33 PM |
| Question: | 9935: Per the General Notes from Addendum #1 it details that the Embankment Material will be used within the control lines, as shown in the Embankment Details Sheet. After review of the sheet it directs the Contractor to install LBR 126 48" from the Bottom of Base. This will eliminate the use for the Type B Stabilization LBR 40 (Min). | Posted: | 4/22/2015 2:51:20 PM |
| Answer: | LBR 126 material shall be installed from 36" below bottom of the stabilized subgrade (48" below bottom of the base) to the bottom of the subgrade. The subgrade shall have minimum LBR 40. | Status:<br><br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br><br>4/22/2015 4:34:11 PM |
| Question: | 9936: As per the Q&A the Department has directed the Contractors to eliminate the Stabilization and instead install LBR 126. "LBR 126 material shall be installed 48" below bottom of the base, not below stabilized subgrade." | Posted: | 4/22/2015 2:53:22 PM |
| Answer: | LBR 126 material shall be installed from 36" below bottom of the stabilized subgrade (48" from the bottom of the base). Stabilized subgrade shall have minimum LBR 40. | Status:<br><br>Posted: | ANSWER PUBLISHED<br><br>4/22/2015 4:12:29 PM |
| Question: | 9937: In Addendum #2 Plan revision page 2. We would like to request a copy of ICA report as stated in number 8. | Posted: | 4/22/2015 3:11:26 PM |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Answer: | ICA Report is attached to response to Question 9930. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 4/22/2015 4:53:46 PM |