



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

6/15/2016 9:54:14 AM

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

District Phone: (954) 777-4130

Proposal: T4434

Project: 231440-2-52-01

Letting Date: 6/15/2016

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: CR 712 (MIDWAY RD)

Question: 14306: Is it the intent of pay item 0286-1 to use 6 inch concrete? Posted: 5/2/2016 1:29:57 PM

Answer: 0286-1 was used for the turnout construction in accordance with the BOE and the standard specification. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/5/2016 9:46:57 AM

Question: 14431: The quantities for Bid Items (0430-175-248) 48" Elliptical and (0430-175-266) 66" Elliptical appear to be transposed as compared to the quantities shown for those two items in the Drainage Summary Table (Roadway Plan Sheet #29)? Please correct. Posted: 5/9/2016 4:07:53 PM

Answer: The quantities are correct in the Summary of Drainage Structures and are transposed in the Summary of Pay Items. The Summary of Pay Items will be corrected by revision. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/17/2016 7:50:18 AM

Question: 14432: Plan Sheet #231 defines Structure S-116 as a Type H. Plan Sheet #252 defines structure S-116 as two Type C Inlets with the Thirsty Duck. Which one is correct? Also, if the two Type C Inlets are correct, are they paid for separately or is the cost of these structures to be included in Pay Item (0916-438-1) Buoyant Flow Control Device, Project 231440-2-52-1? Posted: 5/9/2016 4:09:10 PM

Answer: S-116 shall be constructed as shown on the Miscellaneous Drainage Details. The plans will be updated to reflect the revision. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Thanks,

Posted: 5/11/2016 8:50:58 AM

Question:	14443: The "Optional Materials Tabulation" for Drainage Pipe does not include either Polypropylene Pipe or HDPE Class II as acceptable materials. Both pipe types are approved for 100 year DSL applications. We are asking for Polypropylene Pipe and HDPE Class II to be allowed/included as an optional pipe material (as long as min/max cover requirements are met).	Posted:	5/10/2016 12:26:27 PM
Answer:	"Polypropylene pipe is allowed as an optional pipe material as long as the FDOT's minimum cover requirements is met and is not directly under the pavement as required by the County."	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/17/2016 7:51:13 AM
Question:	14477: Are there any restrictions on building an extended bulkhead from either the northwest or northeast side of the existing bridge to facilitate demolition or test pile installation?	Posted:	5/12/2016 11:09:31 AM
Answer:	Any additional bulkhead construction would require design, approval, and potential permit modifications. The Contract Documents allow alternative construction techniques; however, at this time the Department will neither consider nor guarantee approval of alternatives or deviations from the plans. The Contractor shall bid what is shown in the plans. The Contractor may submit any deviation from the plans for Department review through the Cost Savings Initiative (CSI) process, at which time the Department will consider and either approve or deny the CSI once it has been reviewed completely versus the Contract Documents.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/17/2016 8:03:44 AM
Answer:	Any additional bulkhead construction would require design, approval, and potential permit modifications	Status:	ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted:	5/17/2016 7:49:57 AM
Question:	14478: Will the Contractor be required to provide the permanent sheet pile with the specified inorganic zinc primer coating as per Standard Specification, 560-11.2?	Posted:	5/12/2016 11:31:04 AM
Answer:	Yes, the coating is required per the specification.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/16/2016 11:37:38 AM
Question:	14487: Are we allowed to have nightly lane closures?	Posted:	5/13/2016 8:01:04 AM
Answer:	The TCP notes state that lane closures are allowed on CR 712 from 9:00am to 4:00pm. Lane closures are not allowed at any time on Saturday or Sunday.(NO NIGHT LANE CLOSURES ARE ALLOWED)	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/16/2016 11:36:54 AM

Question:	14488: Can CAD files be provided with the Area ID.	Posted:	5/13/2016 8:02:48 AM
Answer:	The CAD files are provided on the CPP site.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/17/2016 8:42:12 AM
Question:	14497: On the LD-5 Tabulation of Quantities: It list Large: Live Oak - FG-12" cal, 25'HT x 15' Sprd. However there is not a quantity listed. To clarify, we should ignore this item?	Posted:	5/13/2016 1:36:24 PM
Answer:	Yes, the confirmed quantity for Live Oak (12") is zero	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/16/2016 11:37:18 AM
Question:	14544: The bid quantity of Bid item 0400-2-4 Concrete Class II, Bridge Superstructure, is 833.6 CY. I have calculated 635 CY. A breakdown of my takeoff is as follows: 49 CY for the traffic separator, 101 CY for the sidewalks and 485 CY for the deck. Please provide back up for the 833.6 CY bid item quantity.	Posted:	5/16/2016 2:45:10 PM
Answer:	The plans and quantity will be revised by plan revision. The concrete quantity listed for Phase II on the plans will be 400.6 cy for a total superstructure concrete quantity of 617.1 cy. The breakdown is deck (including haunches and thickened edges) = 471.08 cy, Sidewalks = 103.85 cy and Traffic Separators = 42.22 cy.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/17/2016 10:23:16 AM
Question:	14559: Please verify, Pay Item 0430-185-142: PIPE CULVERT, OPTIONAL MATERIAL, ROUND, JACK & BORE, 42", STORM AND CROSS DRAIN is a carrier pipe of 42" diameter with no casing pipe to be installed around the carrier pipe, yes or no?	Posted:	5/17/2016 10:50:49 AM
Answer:	The 42" pipe should be a steel casing. The optional materials tabulation will be updated by revision.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
	Thanks,	Posted:	5/18/2016 11:59:27 AM
Question:	14566: Melville Road has 2 runs of pipe (48" & 36") with 9 structures in the mill and pave section (130+97-141+40) should the cost of reconstruction Melville from 130+97-141+40 be included in the pipe?	Posted:	5/17/2016 5:03:42 PM

Answer:	The cost of restoration of the existing roadway is included in the associated pipe pay items. Revision number 1 has added the resurfacing of Melville Road to the roadway plans.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/18/2016 11:59:11 AM
Question:	14646: Who is responsible for the mowing of the project during the Landscaping Maintenance Period.	Posted: 5/23/2016 9:26:28 AM
Answer:	There is no Landscape Maintenance Period. Per Project note 16 on sheet 33, mowing and litter removal within the project limits shall be performed by St. Lucie County	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/1/2016 1:57:39 PM
Question:	14647: What is the payment percentage on the landscaping schedule?	Posted: 5/23/2016 9:27:30 AM
Answer:	One Time Payment At Final Acceptance.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/1/2016 2:06:28 PM
Question:	14648: What is the length of the Landscape establishment period.	Posted: 5/23/2016 9:29:00 AM
Answer:	Per FDOT policy, the establishment period ends at final acceptance	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/1/2016 2:06:14 PM
Question:	14668: On Page LD-19 : Existing Tree to be relocated per pay Item 110-1 -1 Field Locate tree within limits of white City Park. Upon site visit to locate tree to properly quote this item we could not determine the tree as located on plans. Please advise how we can locate tree, or give tree type and specification.	Posted: 5/24/2016 8:33:23 AM
Answer:	The existing tree to be relocated is a 34-inch live oak located at approximately Sta. 60+50 (LT).	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 8:29:08 AM
Question:	14751: The open trench conduit (pay item 630-2-11) on sheets T-5, T-6, T-7 & T-8 is incorrectly quantified. The plans sheets have quantified as per each conduit when rather, per the FDOT Basis of Estimates, the open trench conduit should be quantified per the length of the trench. Because of this error, the quantity listed in the bid tabulations is grossly overstated. Will this be corrected/revised?	Posted: 5/31/2016 2:27:56 PM

Answer:	The plan labels for the open trench conduit on signalization plan sheets T-5 thru T-8 currently show the total length of conduit for multiple trenches. Since we do not have time to revised the plans prior to be letting, bid the item as shown on the plans. Ie, the Department will compensate for linear footage of conduit in the same trench, instead of length of the trench. This will only apply to the open trench conduits that currently show the total length of conduit for multiple trenches.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 5:48:28 PM
Question:	14752: Sheet T-7 of the Signalization plans shows both concrete pole removal (total of 4/pay item 641-2-70) and span wire removal items (pay item 634-4-600). Per the current FDOT Basis of Estimates, if the concrete poles are being removed, then the span wire, traffic signals, etc, are incidental to the span wire removal item but, in this case, the plans are showing both. It appears the poles may remain due to being joint-use poles so unclear what to include in which removal item or if one of the removal items should be deleted. Please advise.	Posted: 5/31/2016 3:03:17 PM
Answer:	Pay item 634-4-600 is being removed with Revision No. 2 (6/3/2016)	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 7:17:48 AM
Question:	14764: Sheet L-23 of the Lighting Plans specifies #4/0 conductor for the service feeder to the Load center but doesn't list any other conductors required besides that #4/0 or how many of the #4/0 are required. Please advise.	Posted: 6/1/2016 9:15:41 AM
Answer:	On sheet L-23, the table for Load Center "A" states 240/480V service single phase, 3 wire.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 7:18:14 AM
Question:	14765: Sheet L-23 of the Lighting Plans lists the service feeder conduit and conductor size for the load center but, the plans do not show where the power source is located, in order to price the correct length of the service feeder. Please advise.	Posted: 6/1/2016 9:17:30 AM
Answer:	There is an existing transformer on the southeast corner of Sunrise and Midway located at approximate station 365+85, 50' RT. Rob Morris (FPL distribution representative) confirmed the 240 / 480 v lighting service would be provided in this area.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 8:23:15 AM
Question:	14878: The lane closure time restrictions will not allow for all of the CIPP liners to be installed within the allotted time-frames. A 12 hour window is needed to line some of the existing pipes from structure to structure. Will the department extend the daytime lane closure restrictions or allow longer night time lane closures, to accommodate the time required for the work?	Posted: 6/6/2016 8:40:41 AM

Answer:	The Department will allow a 12 hours window if needed for CIPP liner work. A plan revision will be forwarded after letting.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 7:18:36 AM
Question:	14879: The drawings show some of the pipes that are to be lined tie into pipes that are to be replaced or new in some areas. The CIPP process will require lining from structure to structure. How does the department intend to pay for the liner as we would require terminating in each structure, thereby lining some of the new pipe?	Posted: 6/6/2016 9:07:41 AM
Answer:	It is the Department's intent to compensate only for the old pipe. If the CIPP process requires from structure to structure, the cost of lining new pipe needs to be included in the cost lining of the old pipe.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 5:53:13 PM
Question:	14880: There is a 24" x 24" square box culvert on the plans called out to be lined. This particular line is not a 24" equivalent pipe. We suggest that it be removed from the 0-24" pay item and be paid as a separate line item? We also suggest requiring a different thickness on this box as it is not a traditional candidate for CIPP.	Posted: 6/6/2016 9:18:41 AM
Answer:	Since the Department not able to provide a plan revision prior to this bid, Bid this item under the 0-24" pay item. After the letting, the project team (contractor and the Department) will need to investigate if we need to require a different thickness on this box.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 5:57:13 PM
Question:	14931: You show all the messages and arrows to be preformed. Typically on this kind of project on the bike messages and arrows would be preform. Is there a reason for this?	Posted: 6/7/2016 3:43:54 PM
Answer:	The design intent is to utilize preformed messages.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/9/2016 7:19:35 AM
Question:	14967: Please refer to plan sheet 12 of 14 Superstructure Details, Elevation A-A in the As-Built. In phase 1 demolition of the bridge the post tensioned bars will be cut. Is the Department willing to allow traffic to travel on a structure that is no longer post tensioned?	Posted: 6/8/2016 3:45:05 PM

Answer: Existing bridge has only two transverse post tensioning bars per span. These post tension bars are grouted and therefore can be cut. Traffic will be allowed on the bridge after these bars are cut as shown on sheet B1-05 of the bridge plans. The transverse post tensioned bars provide no structural support for the beams.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/9/2016 8:22:05 AM

Question: 14998: On Addendum #2, you've revised quantities in the Signalization plans, for Item #630-2-11. This item has been quantified using the total conduit lengths, and not the total trench lengths. In example, Sheet T-5 shows a quantity of 945 in the Tabulation of Quantities, however, if you actually take off the quantity shown it is only 323 trench feet, as marked on Sheet T-5. The problem is that this is now going to skew the bid as the contractor will bid to the plans, but the CEI will pay by the "Length of Trench" as specified in the Standard Specifications. The Basis of Estimates clearly states that this conduit item it to be quantified using "Trench" footage and the engineer is responsible to verify the total number of conduits. Please revise the plans to reflect the correct quantities of this item or verify that the department will pay for this item by the "Linear Foot", instead of "Trench Foot". This example is true for this item on Sheets T-5 thru T-8. There is no conduit on Sheet T-4.

Posted: 6/12/2016 6:52:12 PM

Answer: Since we do not have time to revised the plans prior to be letting, bid the item as shown on the plans. Ie, the Department will compensate for linear footage of conduit in the same trench, instead of length of the trench. This will only apply to the open trench conduits that currently show the total length of conduit for multiple trenches. The Department will pay for this item by the "Linear Foot", instead of "Trench Foot". The Department will process a Supplemental Agreement after pre-construction to change the Standard Specification for this item.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/13/2016 7:20:37 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 VOIDED

Posted: 6/13/2016 3:27:39 AM

Question: 14999: (Question #14998 Continued) Sheet T-4 is showing 150 LF of Item #630-2-11 in the Tabulation of Quantities for Signalization; Sheet T-4 are the Signalization Project Notes. Sheet T-9 & T-10 appear to have been properly quantified. As previously stated, this item has been misquantified and there will be no way for the department to accurately pay for this item (as it is currently), without either underpaying the contractor or overpaying the contractor, as the method of calculation for this item is not consistent. Please advise...

Posted: 6/12/2016 8:37:05 PM

Answer: See answer 14998

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/13/2016 7:21:26 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 VOIDED
		Posted:	6/13/2016 3:27:39 AM