



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

2/24/2016 1:32:23 PM

District Address: District 4 Construction Office, located at 3400 West Commercial Blvd. Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309

District Phone: (954) 777-4130

Proposal: T4423

Project: 230338-4-52-01

Letting Date: 2/24/2016

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 614 (INDRIO RD)

---

Question: 13103: Throughout the signalization plans, pay item 630-2-11 "Open Trench" is being utilized for conduits that cross the intersections. Should these items be designated with a 630-2-12 pay item for "Directional Bore" instead? Posted: 1/27/2016 12:00:57 PM

---

Answer: Per Estimates Bulletin 12-15, the open trench method was chosen based on existing conditions. The areas of the conduit installation were either in existing areas that did not have pavement, sidewalk or driveways to remain or the area was being reconstructed. However, the contractor has the option to use directional bore at no additional compensation. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 1/29/2016 11:12:10 AM

---

Question: 13107: The lighting plans utilize pay item 630-2-11 "open trench" across driveways and intersections through the plans. Should the use of 630-2-12 "Directional Bore" be utilized instead? Posted: 1/27/2016 1:55:04 PM

---

Answer: Per Estimates Bulletin 12-15, the open trench method was chosen based on existing conditions. The areas of the conduit installation were either in existing areas that did not have pavement, sidewalk or driveways to remain or the area was being reconstructed. However, the contractor has the option to use directional bore at no additional compensation. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 1/29/2016 11:13:03 AM

---

Question: 13162: Some of the typical sections show SP traffic levels B and C having PG (76-22) but the pay item numbers for these traffic levels are for non polymer mixes. Are we to include the cost for these polymer mixes show in the typical sections in the pay item provided? Posted: 2/3/2016 10:10:48 AM

---

Answer: For additional clarity, the response is amended as follows: The PG (76-22) designation has been removed from the pavement design for SP. The typical section plan sheets have been updated, there are no changes to the pay items. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/17/2016 1:25:41 PM

Answer:	The pavement does not require PG(76-22). The pay items are correct.	Status: ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted: 2/15/2016 3:43:58 PM
Question:	13173: The Temporary Traffic Control plans do not provide enough information on the side streets (Spanish Lakes, Johnston, and Emerson) to do a proper takeoff on the temporary asphalt and temporary lime rock base. Will more plan sheets be provided and not just the estimated quantity of 4012sy?	Posted: 2/4/2016 7:25:47 AM
Answer:	The temporary traffic control plans include typical sections for the side streets. The temporary asphalt shown on these typical sections is an estimated quantity of 4,012 SY. No additional plan sheets are necessary.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 2/16/2016 9:41:21 AM
Question:	13174: The Temporary Control Plans do not show how to handle the MOT on Spanish Lakes, Johnston and Emerson at the tie-ins to the end of the job. Will more information be provided to safely construct these tie-ins?	Posted: 2/4/2016 7:39:45 AM
Answer:	Temporary lane closures utilizing flagging operations per Note 4 of the Temporary Traffic Control Project Notes can be used to tie-in the new alignment to the existing along Spanish Lakes Blvd. Johnston Rd and Emerson Ave are included in the typical sections provided in the Temporary Traffic Control Plans. The tie-in areas along Johnston Rd and Emerson Ave will utilize temporary lane closures per Note 4 of the Temporary Traffic Control Project Notes to transition from Phase I to Phase II.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 2/18/2016 3:57:47 PM
Question:	13241: There are four pay items for the foundation piling. 455-34-105, 455-34-205, 455-143-105, 455-143-205. Which items are intended for the use of internal gauges and likewise external gauges?	Posted: 2/10/2016 9:31:31 AM
Answer:	These are bid alternates for bridge piling and test piling. For Bridge No. 940164 the contractor shall bid either Alternate 1 - Pay Items AA1 455-34-105 and AA1 455-143-105 or Alternate 2 - Pay Items AA2 455-34-205 and AA2 455-143-205. For Bridge No. 940165 the contractor shall bid either Alternate 1 - Pay Item AA1 455-34-105 or Alternate 2 - Pay Item AA2 455-34-205.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 2/15/2016 3:43:29 PM
Question:	13307: Could the earthwork cross sections for stations 183+00 to 197+00 ( split cross sections) be updated to provide match line information (Offsets, elevation at the offsets) the current sections are shown without adjusting the vertical elevations on the left side). In addition, cross section 188+00,192+00 and 193+00 the existing and proposed appear to switch at the match line- could these section be verified?	Posted: 2/12/2016 1:12:42 PM

Answer:	Updated cross sections with correct elevations have been provided with Amendment No. 2	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/18/2016 3:58:28 PM
Question:	13325: Is there ability to access each pond location to dig test holes for subsurface investigation?	Posted:	2/15/2016 10:09:33 AM
Answer:	Any subsurface investigations at the each pond location prior to letting will require the Contractor to comply with the Federal Endangered Species Act and other wildlife regulations.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/15/2016 11:01:32 AM
Question:	13330: Sheet No. 30 has S-94B designated as a Ditch Bottom Inlet but the remaining Structures 304, 426, 506 are categorized as Inlet Specials. Please clarify the designation and update the Bid Items to reflect the correct bid items as either Ditch Bottom Inlets or Special Inlets.	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:22:22 PM
Answer:	The outfall control structure detailed on sheet 231 are to be paid as type D modified ditch bottom inlets. The summary of drainage structure table has been updated.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/16/2016 9:42:55 AM
Question:	13331: Sheet No. 41 from S-102 to S-410 do not have any structure designations. Will the Department provide an updated sheet with the correct designations?	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:23:56 PM
Answer:	No updated plan sheets required. Sheet 40 accounts for the structure type for S-102 and S-410.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/16/2016 9:43:16 AM
Question:	13332: Sheet No. 32 has S-304 designated as an Inlet Special but there isn't a bid item for this inlet. Please confirm and provide a bid item for this control structure.	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:25:00 PM
Answer:	The outfall control structures detailed on sheet 231 are to be paid as Type D modified ditch bottom inlets. The summary of drainage table has been updated.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/16/2016 9:43:40 AM
Question:	13333: S-404A doesn't have a classification. It appears to be a U-Endwall Structure. Please confirm and provide clarification on Sheet No. 41 and include a bid item for this structure.	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:26:31 PM

---

Answer: Please see sheet number 212 for the drainage structure information for S-404. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/16/2016 9:43:59 AM

---

Question: 13334: Sheet No. 34 has S-426 designated as an Inlet Special but there isn't a bid item for this inlet. Please confirm and provide a bid item for this control structure. Posted: 2/15/2016 12:27:34 PM

---

Answer: Outfall control structures detailed on sheet 231 are to be paid as Type D modified ditch bottom inlets. The summary of drainage structure table has been updated. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/16/2016 9:44:27 AM

---

Question: 13335: Sheet No. 34 has S-506 designated as an Inlet Special but there isn't a bid item for this inlet. Please confirm and provide a bid item for this control structure. Posted: 2/15/2016 12:28:24 PM

---

Answer: The outfall structures detailed on sheet 231 are to be paid as type D modified ditch bottom inlets. The summary of drainage structure table has been updated. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/16/2016 8:53:55 AM

---

Question: 13336: Sheet No. 39 & 77 do not show that S-544 has a structure with it. Please confirm that this run doesn't have to have either an Straight Endwall, Mitered End Section or U-Endwalls on the both ends of this pipe run. Posted: 2/15/2016 12:29:26 PM

---

Answer: S-544 does not require endwall, no end treatments are required. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/16/2016 8:53:14 AM

---

Question: 13337: Sheet No. 39 & 79 do not show that S-545 has a structure with it. Please confirm that this run doesn't have to have either an Straight Endwall, Mitered End Section or U-Endwalls on the both ends of this pipe run. Posted: 2/15/2016 12:30:20 PM

---

Answer: S-545 does not require an end wall, no end treatments are required. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/16/2016 8:52:46 AM

---

Question: 13338: Sheet No. 39 & 79 do not show that S-546 has a structure with it. Please confirm that this run doesn't have to have either an Straight Endwall, Mitered End Section or U-Endwalls on the both ends of this pipe run. Posted: 2/15/2016 12:31:38 PM

Answer:	S-546 does not require an end wall, no end treatments are required.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/16/2016 8:52:16 AM
Question:	13339: Sheet No. 94 calls out S-527B but there isn't a structure type in Sheets No. 42 & 43. Please confirm and update the sheets to depict the structure to be constructed.	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:32:32 PM
Answer:	Sheet 94 correctly references S-527B and it is also indicated correctly on sheet 42 as the structure type to be 24" inch pipe. No sheets need to be updated.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/15/2016 1:53:16 PM
Question:	13340: The bid items do not include landscape, tree relocation or tree removal. Please confirm if these items are not needed or update the bid items to reflect these activities.	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:33:42 PM
Answer:	Tree removal is included in clearing and grubbing. There is no other landscaping or tree relocations.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/16/2016 8:49:26 AM
Question:	13341: Reference Cross Sections 232+00 and 233+00 on sheet #268. The cross sectional area of regular excavation is tabulated at "1" for each cross section. Typical Section (3)top on sheet #20 applies to these cross sections and indicates no existing pavement to remain from Sta 231+00 to 251+30.00. This would result in a substantially higher cross sectional area of regular excavation at Sta 232+00 and 233+00 due to the requirement to remove the existing roadway. This discrepancy occurs on numerous other cross sections along the project alignment. In cases of this and similar discrepancies please confirm that the above interpretation of the project typical sections governs and that the cross sectional areas of regular excavation identified in the cross section excavation tabulations shall be disregarded.	Posted:	2/15/2016 12:35:03 PM
Answer:	Payment for removal of the existing pavement is included in clearing and grubbing not in the regular excavation. Regular Excavation is a plan quantity item. Any adjustment to the plan quantity amount with the except of a plan revisions will require the contractor to submit at their own expense, evidence of such in the form of acceptable and verifiable measurements or calculations.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/16/2016 9:58:51 AM
Question:	13344: In the pavement marking tabulation of quantities all Thermoplastic Arrows are shown as pay item 711-14-170 (Preformed Thermoplastic). Typically on asphalt pavement only the Bike Arrows would be preformed material. The cost difference for the material is significant. Does the DOT intend to change the regular arrows to a 711 11 170 (Standard Thermoplastic) pay item and leave only the Bike Arrows as being Preformed?	Posted:	2/15/2016 2:22:47 PM

---

Answer: The thermoplastic arrow quantities and pay items will remain as shown in the plans. No additional pay item will be added for the thermoplastic arrows.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/17/2016 12:09:39 PM

---

Question: 13379: Based on the quantities given you have all the messages as preformed when typically only bike messages and arrows are preformed. Is there a reason for this?

Posted: 2/17/2016 10:55:27 AM

---

Answer: The thermoplastic messages will remain as shown in the plans, no adjustments to pay items will be made.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/17/2016 12:06:45 PM

---

Question: 13383: We respectfully request that the letting is postponed one week.

Posted: 2/17/2016 1:56:18 PM

---

Answer: The Department has reviewed the request to delay the letting. The decision is to keep the letting as proposed.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/18/2016 3:59:47 PM

---

Question: 13388: Addendum #2 changed S-94B to "0425 1549 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, MODIFY". This structure is New Construction and it is approx. 10.5' in height. We believe that the correct designation should be "0425 1542 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, >10" Please confirm what the correct designation is.

Posted: 2/17/2016 3:22:03 PM

---

Answer: Pay item is correct. Please bid under item number 0425-1-54 as shown in the plans.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/18/2016 4:03:22 PM

---

Question: 13389: Addendum #2 changed S-304 to "0425 1549 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, MODIFY". This structure is New Construction and it is approx. 8' in height. We believe that the correct designation should be "0425 1541 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, <10" Please confirm what the correct designation is.

Posted: 2/17/2016 3:23:11 PM

---

Answer: Pay item is correct. Please bid under item number 0425-1-54 as shown in the plans.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/18/2016 4:03:37 PM

Question:	13390: Addendum #2 changed S-426 to "0425 1549 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, MODIFY". This structure is New Construction and it is approx. 10' in height. We believe that the correct designation should be "0425 1541 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, <10" Please confirm what the correct designation is.	Posted:	2/17/2016 3:24:04 PM
Answer:	Pay item is correct. Please bid under item number 0425-1-54 as shown in the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/18/2016 4:04:37 PM
Question:	13391: Addendum #2 changed S-506 to "0425 1549 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, MODIFY". This structure is New Construction and it is approx. 9' in height. We believe that the correct designation should be "0425 1541 - INLETS, DT BOT, TYPE D, <10" Please confirm what the correct designation is.	Posted:	2/17/2016 3:25:31 PM
Answer:	Pay item is correct. Please bid under item number 0425-1-54 as shown in the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/18/2016 4:05:05 PM
Question:	13393: Will the Department allow the Contractor to mine within the project limits to produce his own embankment and other roadway materials for the project?	Posted:	2/17/2016 3:55:21 PM
Answer:	No	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/17/2016 4:58:50 PM
Question:	13396: The answer to question 13339 indicates that S-527B is indeed a 24" Metal Pipe with no associated drainage structure. Can the quantities be updated to include this 20 LF of pipe in the appropriate Optional Pipe Material Bid Item?	Posted:	2/17/2016 3:59:19 PM
Answer:	S-527B includes 102 LF of 24" optional pipe - the requirement is 20 LF of the pipe at the outfall is metal pipe. The optional material table shows allowable metal pipe.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	2/18/2016 4:04:21 PM
Question:	13401: Sheet No. 233 illustrates the Endwall Section of S-319 (LT). Can you clarify if the 72.5 CY is for both Endwalls?	Posted:	2/17/2016 4:38:25 PM

---

Answer:	Sheet 233 detail applies to headwall on Left (North side of Indrio) which requires additional Rip Rap - the quantity of Rip Rap for that particular headwall is 72.5 CY. In the summary of quantities S-319 the total quantity of rip rap is 97.8 CY which accounts for both headwalls.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 2/18/2016 4:04:04 PM

---

Question:	13414: With regard to Question 13103 & 13107, you state that "Open trench method was chosen ... "; Does item #630-1-11 also include the costs of the flowable fill that WILL BE REQUIRED to fill these trenches across the roadways to maintain density, as well as the plant opening fees required to open the concrete plant at night? Will the FDOT allow for the complete closure of each affected roadway for an entire day, to minimize these costs, instead of the contractor having to close half of the roadway at a time? Have the MOT items been quantified to include all of the additional MOT devices and personnel that will be required to utilize this method? As the previously referenced questions stated, the conduit within the roadways should have been and needs to be reclassified to minimize these costs and accurately reflect the true scope of work, which should be Directionally Bored Conduit. Will the department please reconsider this to reflect how the project will actually be built by a contractor?	Posted: 2/19/2016 9:14:29 AM
-----------	--	------------------------------

---

Answer:	Since this project is a total roadway reconstruction, the contractor has two choices when the conduit can be installed. Either before the roadway is being built or after the roadway has been built.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 2/19/2016 10:59:09 AM

It has been a long time policy that if the contractor installs the contractor after the roadway has been built, the Department does not compensate the work under the Underpavement Pay Item.

The contractor has the option to use direction bore in lieu of open trenching at no additional cost to the Department. If the contractor elects to use flowable fill, the cost is included in the price of the conduit. See Spec 630-3.1 and 630-4.2.

The Department will not consider complete closure of each affected roadway for an entire day. The Department will compensate under the appropriate MOT pay items.