



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

10/28/2015 8:16:32 AM

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

District Phone: (386) 943-5350

Proposal: T5558

Project: 238422-1-52-01

Letting Date: 10/28/2015

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 25 (US 27)

Question: 11949: This question is to clarify that the quantities for regular excavation and embankment do NOT include the volume of existing flexible pavement to be removed. Posted: 10/2/2015 8:31:03 AM

Answer: Bid Question Response #11949: The volume of existing pavement, including the asphalt and base, is not included in the excavation quantities. The existing pavement removal is included in clearing and grubbing. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 10/8/2015 4:52:10 PM

Question: 12050: Gen files for the design cross sections were provided but not for the existing ground. Can we get the gen files for the existing ground cross sections? Posted: 10/9/2015 10:08:44 AM

Answer: Bid Question Response #12050: The Designer has verified the existing ground line information is contained in the same provided GEN file as the proposed. Settings should be checked to make sure all layers are turned on in the software so that the existing ground line is shown. When the GEN file is imported into the FDOT multi-lane software, a prompt will appear to assign the line type. Designate the letter "T" to the existing ground and "R" to the proposed surface in order to see the existing ground line. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 10/16/2015 2:52:59 PM

Question: 12055: It appears that the utility relocate schedule was not taken into account when calculating the total number of contract days for this project. How can pre-phase 1 have a duration of 140 days with Lake Utility Services having a total of 269 days during construction for pre-phase 1, which does not include the time needed for DEP clearance? Posted: 10/12/2015 8:28:27 AM

Answer: Bid Question Response #12055: Contract time is not set for individual contract phases but for the whole contract. It is the contractor's responsibility to coordinate and manage the utility relocations during all construction phases. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 10/23/2015 6:30:28 PM

Question:	12057: In the signal plans the interconnect sheets T-11 thru T36 shows approximately 7 miles of conduit. Can you please specify the required size of this conduit?	Posted:	10/12/2015 10:23:10 AM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12057: Per the Florida Department of Transportation's Basis of Estimates, the default conduit diameter is 2 inches. All other diameters would be called out and indicated in the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/16/2015 2:54:34 PM
Question:	12059: 0160 4, Stabilization; The typical sections in the plans do not show the subgrade required under the proposed traffic separator as the separator is shown to be Type I, Option I. Is this area to be stabilized? If the area under the traffic separator is to be stabilized is the quantity for this work included in the bid item quantity? Please clarify if area under the proposed traffic separator is to be stabilized or not and confirm if that quantity is included in the current bid quantities or not.	Posted:	10/12/2015 1:14:34 PM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12059: The area under the traffic separator is to be stabilized in accordance with Standard Index 302. This stabilization quantity was included in the bid item quantity for stabilization. The typical section sheet in the plans will be revised for clarification.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/16/2015 2:55:29 PM
Question:	12060: In the signalization plans sheet T-9 calls for type P-VI poles (pay item 641-2-16)however, the pole schedule for this intersection shows type P-VII poles. Can you please specify which pole type is required?	Posted:	10/12/2015 3:57:02 PM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12060: The pole type to be utilized is Pay Item 641-2-17 for Type P-VII. An addendum is forthcoming for clarification.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/16/2015 2:56:28 PM
Question:	12077: The "Optional Materials Tabulation" for Drainage Pipe does not include HDPE Class II or Polypropylene Pipe as an acceptable material. Both HDPE Class II and Polypropylene Pipe are approved for 100 year DSL applications. We are asking for HDPE Class II and Polypropylene Pipe to be allowed/included as an optional pipe material (as long as min/max cover requirements are met).	Posted:	10/13/2015 9:18:56 AM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12077: HDPE Class II and Polypropylene Pipe can be used according to the latest edition Drainage Design Manual criteria. The use of an optional pipe is contingent upon satisfying both design service life and structural cover requirements.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/14/2015 5:14:00 PM

Question:	12080: In Spec Section 8-13.1 the department states "actions by third parties...shall not extend the Original Contract Time for calculation of the "incentive payment". Based on the above spec, if the contractor is delayed by the third party relocating & installing the underground utilities, will the original contract time be extended in regards to incentive/disincentive payment?	Posted:	10/13/2015 2:11:20 PM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12080: Per Spec 8-13.1, For purposes of the calculation and the determination of entitlement to the incentive payment, the Original Contract Time will not be adjusted for any reason, cause or circumstance whatsoever.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/16/2015 3:01:44 PM
Question:	12087: The Survey, Right of Way, and Traffic Control files were not included in the Cadd files that were provided. Because of the amount of existing items to be removed, and temporary pavement for traffic control, it would be beneficial to have this information. Can we get the Survey and Traffic Control files for this project?	Posted:	10/13/2015 5:40:16 PM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12087: The Survey, Right of Way, and Traffic Control files will be provided as part of a forthcoming addendum.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/16/2015 3:03:50 PM
Question:	12096: S-745 to S-746; The drainage cross sections sheet/plan page 307 shows a 30" jack & bore and a concrete collar to be constructed between S-745 & S-746. The plan page 128 only shows this run to be 179' LF of 30" pipe. The summary of drainage structures for this run also does not include quantities for a jack and bore to be constructed at this location. Which is correct? Is a 30" jack & bore to be constructed at this location per the drainage cross sections page 307 or is it to be 179' LF of 30" pipe installation only? Please clarify and revise the summary and bid item quantities if needed or confirm is pipe only is to be constructed this location per plan page 128.	Posted:	10/15/2015 8:14:26 AM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12096: The Drainage Structure Cross Sections and TTCP plans show the jack and bore correctly. The plan sheets will be revised to show this clarification in the forthcoming addendum.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/16/2015 3:05:58 PM
Question:	12100: Is there core data available for the existing pavement thickness? this would be helpful in calculating volumes.	Posted:	10/15/2015 8:57:44 AM
Answer:	Bid Question Response #12100: Due to the complete reconstruction of the 6.5 miles of roadway and only sacrificial milling/resurfacing to tie at each end, no pavement cores were performed for this project. However, the road was scanned using GPR for approximate asphalt thickness and this data will be provided. Also, the pavement design for two most recent resurfacing projects (one for the NB lanes and the other for the SB lanes) will be provided as supporting documentation to this answer.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/23/2015 6:29:38 PM

Document: 4427580: 407152-1 (025-2002) NB.pdf

NB Pavement Design

Document: 4427583: 421981-1 (025-2007) SB.pdf

SB Pavement Design

Document: 4427584: GPR 11200 SR25 238422-1 (2).xls

GPR Data

Question: 12115: Please provide minimum required thickness of base rock required for the temporary pavement. Posted: 10/16/2015 10:01:33 AM

Answer: Bid Question Response #12115 The Contractor is responsible for providing and maintaining a temporary pavement design that will accommodate the existing traffic loading. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 10/16/2015 3:07:26 PM

Question: 12116: In regards to Note 4 on Sheet 20 of the plan set. What defines "Hard material", can boring logs be provided for this area to determine what special equipment/procedures will be required? Posted: 10/16/2015 10:08:52 AM

Answer: Bid Question Response #12116: The borings performed for the ponds are shown in the pond cross sections. The SPT boring for pond C (designated P-16) is shown on sheet 333. Additional information on this boring can be found on sheets 357 and 397. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 10/23/2015 6:20:13 PM

Question: 12117: In regards to the temporary barrier wall shown in the legend on sh. 685, the legend calls for Temporary Barrier wall K (staked) (With Type C steady burn light). Will the Type C light be required since new 2016 standard doesn't require it? Posted: 10/16/2015 10:22:18 AM

Answer: Bid Question Response #12117: The Contractor shall comply with the 2015 Standard Index which requires barrier delineators (reflectors) to be utilized. The plans will be revised to remove the type C steady burn lights from the Temporary Barrier wall K (staked). Please see latest addendum for clarification. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 10/22/2015 3:28:05 PM

Question: 12146: The provided utility work schedules show that Lake Utility Services has significant water main, forcemain and reclaimed water main work during Phase 1 of construction. Can it be assumed that Lake County will be using multiple crews so that water, forcemain and reclaimed water work will be occurring simultaneously?

Posted: 10/20/2015 3:29:23 PM

If this work is performed by one crew (working end to end) then it will be 184 days of utility work which greatly impacts the schedule.

Answer: Bid Question Response #12146: It is the contractor's responsibility to coordinate and manage the utility relocations during all construction phases.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/23/2015 6:15:56 PM

Question: 12195: See note 6 plan sheet 20. Will 2x1/2-lane mills working in echelon be considered "milling 12-ft "in one pass"?"

Posted: 10/22/2015 3:26:45 PM

Answer: Bid Question Response #12195: Contractor shall determine means and methods utilized to provide the required 12 foot milling width.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/23/2015 6:13:40 PM