



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 4/27/2016 8:10:10 AM

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

District Phone: (863) 519-2222

Proposal: T1650

Project: 414547-1-52-01

Letting Date: 4/27/2016

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 35 (US 17)

---

Question: 13645: Request FDOT provide the representative pavement section (i.e., thickness of the asphalt pavt, type & thickness of the existing base matl, etc.)for existing SR-35 that is within the limits of this project. Knowing the type & quantity of these pavement materials will help to determine the demo & disposition. Posted: 3/14/2016 10:29:06 AM

---

Answer: The Department does not guarantee the details or core data within this Pavement Evaluation Report for FPID. 414547-1-52-01. The pavement evaluation report is provided for informational purposes only and is not part of the contract documents. The bidder shall make independent calculations based on the plans and bid solely on their own calculations. The bidder's submission of a proposal is prima facie evidence that the bidder has not relied on the pavement evaluation report . The information given below for project FPID. 414547-1-52-01 is part of the department's pavement evaluation report. No claim for compensation may be based on an inaccuracy contained within the pavement evaluation report or the information given within this answer. The pavement evaluation report can be downloaded as attachment labeled "A". Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/16/2016 5:08:11 PM

---

Document: 4796470: Pages from 4145471\_PavtEvalReport.pdf

Attachment "A"

---

Question: 13730: Will the FDOT be taking ownership of all the asphalt removed from the project or just the quantity identified in the milling pay item? Posted: 3/22/2016 7:03:35 AM

---

Answer: The FDOT shall take ownership of the asphalt quantity identified in the milling pay item/milling areas defined in the plans. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/24/2016 4:20:43 PM

---

Question: 13732: Will there be any buildings left in the ROW for the contractor to remove? Posted: 3/22/2016 7:12:32 AM

Answer:	No. All buildings have been removed.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/24/2016 4:21:56 PM
Question:	13766: Request FDOT provide a minimum Typical Section, &/or the minimum pavement matl/thickness requirements, for the temporary pavement required under the Special Detour bid items. This information is normally included in the TTCP general notes.	Posted:	3/23/2016 2:09:00 PM
Answer:	It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide the pavement design for temporary pavement under the Special Detour items. Per Estimates Bulletin 14-06, "The pavement design, construction, and maintenance of the Special Detour components will be up to the contractor, subject to the geometry (location and cross slope) shown in the plans." Specification 102-6.3 states, "Construct the detour facility to have sufficient durability to remain in good condition, supplemented by maintenance, for the entire period that the detour is required."	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/25/2016 2:46:52 PM
Question:	13767: In comparing the Ph 1, Step 2 TTCP cross-sections to the roadway cross-sections it appears that Asphalt Overbuild will be required on the outside portion of the inside travel lane. Then construct any other adjacent temp pavt that is outside of, and tying into, this temp overbuild area of the existing pavt section. Please confirm that the above is the intention of TTCP. This may be the case at sections of the other temp pavt areas as well.	Posted:	3/23/2016 2:30:01 PM
Answer:	: The Department request's the questioner clarify the question. In the review of the question we found a discrepancy between the roadway cross sections and the TTCP cross sections as a result of a late profile modification to match the as-built condition at the north end of the job, however we are unclear if this is the basis of the questioner's question. We request the questioner give the specific location/direction of travel in question and explain the question in more detail so we can appropriately respond.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/30/2016 4:13:30 PM
Question:	13907: Foundation Note 9 on PS B1-11 and PS B2-11 requires wrapping end bent piles with polyethylene sheeting. This is typically only for piles driven prior to MSE embankment installation or when excessive downdrag is predicted. Pile Data Table indicate zero downdrag for all bridges on the project. Can this reference and Pay Item No. 459-71 be deleted?	Posted:	4/8/2016 10:35:27 AM
Answer:	Downdrag is reported as zero in the plans because we are specifying the use of polyethylene sheeting. Pay item 459-71 shall remain within the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/12/2016 11:21:07 AM

Question:	13908: Pay Item Notes on PS BO-2 for 400-2-4, 400-2-10, and 400-4-5 reference coating construction joints in deck, approach slabs, and caps with a two-part epoxy for widening Bridge 060001. Per SDG and Spec. 400-9.3, this is not a typical task for FDOT bridge widening projects. To provide continuity with FDOT policy can this reference and requirement be removed?	Posted:	4/8/2016 10:36:57 AM
Answer:	No, the 2-part epoxy bonding compound reference and requirement is to remain within the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/12/2016 11:22:13 AM
Question:	13909: Pay Item Notes on PS BO-2 for 458-1-11 references installation of polymeric nosing on the new portions of the approach slabs. Details are provided on B1-33 and B1-37. This is not typical or required for new construction. To provide continuity with FDOT policy can this reference and requirement be removed?	Posted:	4/8/2016 10:37:40 AM
Answer:	The polymeric nosing is to be applied continuously across the full approach slab riding surface widths (from gutterline to gutterline) on NB US 17 over Charlie Creek (Bridge No. 060001) only. The polymeric nosing reference and requirement is to remain within the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/12/2016 11:23:35 AM
Question:	13967: The roadway plans identify the limits of construction which are not the same as the ROW. The utility relocation plans call for most of the utilities to be relocated at the ROW line. There is a discrepancy between the construction limits and the ROW when it comes to the Clearing and Grubbing. Please clarify to which limit the Clearing and Grubbing should be done, construction limits or ROW.	Posted:	4/12/2016 1:09:59 PM
Answer:	For clarification, all Clearing and Grubbing should be to the limits of construction as defined in the plans. The UAO's are responsible for any clearing and grubbing required for their relocations.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/15/2016 3:08:19 PM
Question:	14028: Will all the production pile be PDA tested as stated in the Basis of Estimates, 455-143-ABB under the notes, "Effective July 2015: Pay Item Structure expanded for 100% Dynamic Testing. See details below"?	Posted:	4/14/2016 5:45:30 PM
Answer:	This project does not require 100% dynamic testing of production piles.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/15/2016 3:06:58 PM
Question:	14030: Will the cost of the PDA testing be covered by the Department's CEI?	Posted:	4/14/2016 5:47:36 PM

---

Answer: Payment for any/all required dynamic testing shall be in accordance with section 455 of the standard specifications. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 4/15/2016 3:09:41 PM

---

Question: 14209: You have the bike messages under regular thermoplastic pay items. All bike messages and arrows should be under the preformed pay items. Can you correct this? Posted: 4/21/2016 10:44:39 AM

---

Answer: Questions posted to this site before 5:00 P.M. (EST) on the seventh calendar day prior to the bid opening, or tenth day prior to the December bid opening will be responded to by the Department. For Questions posted after these times, an answer cannot be assured. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 4/25/2016 3:26:14 AM