



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 5/23/2018 9:01:00 AM

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

District Phone: (863) 519-2222

Proposal: T1709

Project: 201032-2-52-01

Letting Date: 5/23/2018

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 93 (I-75)

Question:	21575: Sheets U-23, U-24 and U-26 depict an existing 54" RCP casing that will be connected to a proposed 54" split steel casing. Is there a detail for connecting the existing RCP casing to the proposed steel casing?	Posted:	3/28/2018 10:14:58 AM
Answer:	Please refer to the use of FDOT Index 280; Concrete Jacket for Connecting Dissimilar Types of Pipe.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/6/2018 6:49:57 AM
Question:	21577: Plan sheet U-25 depicts a proposed 6" DIP water main being installed under an existing 36" DIP force main. As a result, the main at the proposed fire hydrant location is about 17' below grade. Should the water main not be installed above the force main and based on depths is this a viable option for the hydrant location considering hydrant extensions and valve box extensions needed?	Posted:	3/28/2018 10:28:19 AM
Answer:	Please see Revision # 1, Addendum # 1 for the updated location of the 6" DIP water main that was sent out to all prospective bidders on April 10, 2018.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/11/2018 2:56:58 PM
Question:	21589: On plan sheet 698 of the TTC plans, phase 1 phasing notes states to utilize low profile barrier wall for all phases on SR-70. Plan sheets 775-794 of the TTC Plans call out temporary concrete barrier wall type K. Please advise as to what type of temporary concrete barrier wall is to be installed on SR-70.	Posted:	3/29/2018 3:33:04 PM
Answer:	Concrete Barrier, Type K is to be utilized. The Phase 1 Phasing Note will be revised to delete the reference to low profile barrier as Revision #1, Addendum #1 and was sent out to all prospective bidders on 4/9/2018.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/10/2018 5:23:53 PM

Question: 21590: In reference to Special Detours 1 & 2 (Bid Items 102-2-1 & 102-2-2): There's no information given in the TTCP plans that identifies what is included in the 2 special detours. Can they be specifically identified including the items that are to be incorporated into each detour? Posted: 3/29/2018 3:58:22 PM

Answer: Please refer to the FDOT Estimates Bulletin 14-06 which can be accessed by following this link: <http://www.fdot.gov/programmanagement/Estimates/BasisofEstimates/BOEManual/Archive/EstimatesBulletin14-06.pdf> Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 4/6/2018 6:48:00 AM

Payment for the work of constructing , maintaining, and removing special detour facilities (earthwork, base, asphalt, etc.) will be paid for as a Special Detour. However, traffic control devices, warning devices, barriers, signing, and pavement markings will continue to be paid under their respective pay items.

Earthwork, base, and asphalt quantities for Special Detours will no longer be shown in the plans. 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.

Question: 21650: Can the Department provide the existing pavement reports for the project? Posted: 4/4/2018 8:57:14 AM

Answer: The Department does not guarantee the details or computations contained within the pavement core report for FPID.201032-2-52-01. The pavement core report is provided for informational purposes only and is not part of the contract documents. The bidder's submission of a proposal is prima facie evidence that the bidder has not relied on the pavement core report. No claim for compensation may be based on an inaccuracy contained within the pavement core report or the information given within this answer. The pavement core may be downloaded as labeled "Attachment "A"". Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 4/10/2018 2:18:11 PM

Document: 7171242: 20103225201_exist pavement.pdf

Attachment "A"

Answer: The Department does not guarantee the details or computations contained within the pavement core report for FPID.201032-2-52-01. The pavement core report is provided for informational purposes only and is not part of the contract documents. The bidder's submission of a proposal is prima facie evidence that the bidder has not relied on the pavement core report. No claim for compensation may be based on an inaccuracy contained within the pavement core report or the information given within this answer. The pavement core may be downloaded as labeled "Attachment "A"". Status: APPLICABLE ANSWER
Posted: 4/10/2018 12:41:47 PM

Question: 21652: Sheet no. 706 temporary drainage structure chart has a grand total of 664 LF of temporary drainage pipe. However, based on the lengths given the total should be 4,873 LF. Posted: 4/4/2018 9:48:32 AM

Answer:	Please see Revision # 1, Addendum # 1 for the updated quantities for temporary drainage pipe that was sent out to all prospective bidders on 4/9/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 4/10/2018 5:24:58 PM
Question:	21685: For the Type V Underdain, it appears as though the detail for Lower Limit "Type V a" would apply. However, please confirm which detail from Index 286 sheet 2 of 2 applies; Upper Limit, Type V a or Type V b?	Posted: 4/5/2018 1:18:44 PM
Answer:	Type Va underdrain shall be utilized. The underdrain shall be constructed according to the flow line elevations shown in the plans.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 4/17/2018 3:46:39 PM
Question:	21692: For the existing concrete box culverts and drainage pipe to remain, will pay items be added for Desilting Concrete Box Culverts and/or Desilting Pipe, 0-24", etc?	Posted: 4/6/2018 9:32:42 AM
Answer:	No, pay items shall not be added for Desilting Concrete Box Culverts and/or Desilting Pipe, 0-24", etc.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 4/11/2018 6:48:45 AM
Question:	21693: For any existing drainage pipe called out to be removed, can any be grouted if warranted due to phasing?	Posted: 4/6/2018 9:36:16 AM
Answer:	All pipes called out to be removed shall be removed.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 4/11/2018 5:00:35 PM
Question:	21694: A bald eagle's nest is shown on the drawings near SR 70. What are the restrictions (time of year, type of work, etc) related to the bald eagle?	Posted: 4/6/2018 9:44:47 AM
Answer:	Please refer to the FDOT Standard Specifications Section 7 "Legal Requirements and Responsibilities to the Public" and Subarticle 7-1.4.1 "Additional Requirements for Bald Eagles" that is included as a Special Provision in the project specification package.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 4/6/2018 1:08:18 PM
Question:	21699: Will the scheduled specification revision referenced in DCE Memo 06-18, 107-7 Traffic Control Officer, be issued and implemented by the letting date?	Posted: 4/6/2018 2:18:31 PM

Answer:	Yes. Please see Memo 06-18 for further information.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/6/2018 2:23:55 PM
Question:	21717: On sheet 697, TTC Plans General Notes, note 14 states that "the Motorist Awareness System shall be implemented 14 days before any lane closure on SR 70". The Motorist Awareness System (MAS), Index 670, is called out for use on roadways of 55 mph and greater and it doesn't indicate that it's used as an advanced warning system. Note 3 on sheet 697 states that I-70 shall maintain a design speed of 45 mph. Is the use of index 670 on SR 70 correct in note 14?	Posted:	4/10/2018 7:30:59 AM
Answer:	The requirement for the Motorist Awareness System (MAS) on SR70 has been removed from the TTC General Notes as part of revision #1. Please see Revision # 1, Addendum # 1 that was sent out to all prospective bidders on April 10, 2018. No additional changes are required.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/11/2018 3:42:12 PM
Question:	21727: On sheet SQ-27, 4" Conc Sidewalk has a total quantity of 3,453 SY which matches the bid quantity; this includes 116.4 SY for "Concrete Slope Pavement". However, there is a pay item for 122 SY of 4" Conc Slope Pavement and I am unable to locate what this refers to. Please advise.	Posted:	4/10/2018 4:09:14 PM
Answer:	The 4" inch cap is incidental to the cost of the wall and the 116.4 SY quantity for 4 inch sidewalk shall be removed from the table as shown in the plans. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as Addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018 .	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/1/2018 4:08:26 PM
Question:	21780: In the TTC plans (sheets 709-714) Phase 2 Stage 2, the plans show temporary diversions for both the EB and WB directions of SR-70. Will these diversions be permitted only on a nightly basis between the hours of 8 PM to 5 AM or are these diversions intended to be long term, greater than 24 hours?	Posted:	4/13/2018 7:44:11 AM
Answer:	The diversions shown may be implemented nightly between 8pm to 5am and weekends from Friday 8pm to Monday 5am as approved by the engineer and subject to specification requirements.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/1/2018 4:15:34 PM
Question:	21805: Plan sheet 365 (Roadway Soil Survey) note 1 states "Fill Materials Utilized to Establish Grades for Linear Ponds Shall Consist of A-3 Sand With Less Than 7% Passing the No. 200 Sieve...". However, plan sheet 73 (General Notes) note 5 has more information than the note above and conflicting information related to the % passing the No. 200 sieve. Please clarify the requirement for the A-3 select fill.	Posted:	4/13/2018 1:58:47 PM

Answer:	The General Notes note 5 is correct. The Roadway Soil Survey note 1 shall be revised to match the General Notes. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:03:28 PM
Question:	21918: The Summary of Quantities (25) sheet SQ-25, Pay Item 0521 8 81 (Concrete Traffic Railing Barrier, with junction slab, 32" F shape), Includes stations 4425+40.91 to 4432+20.00. Permanent Retaining Wall plan sheet BW-1 shows no MSE wall at this location, and Roadway Plan (13A) sheet 86 has a call out at this station for Shldr Conc Barrier wall. Please clarify which pay item this wall should be in.	Posted: 4/19/2018 8:49:46 AM
Answer:	Pay Item 521-72-3 (Shoulder Concrete Barrier, Rigid-Shoulder) should be used for stations 4425+40.91 to 4432+20.00. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:18:42 PM
Question:	21920: The Summary of Quantities (25) sheet SQ-25, Pay Item 0521 8 81 (Concrete Traffic Railing Barrier, with junction slab, 32" F shape), includes stations 802+71.52 to 814+80.00. Roadway Plan (12) sheet 85 and Permanent Retaining Wall Plan sheet BW-7, calls for MSE Wall W1 from station 804+50 to 814+90. Please clarify the begin and end stations for the above-mentioned pay item (0521 8 81) and also which pay item should the barrier wall that's just prior to MSE wall W1 (802+71.52 to 804+50) fall under?	Posted: 4/19/2018 9:09:12 AM
Answer:	Pay Item 521-72-3 Shoulder Concrete Barrier, Rigid-Shoulder limits are from Sta. 802+71.52 to Sta. 804+50.00. Pay Item 521-8-1 Concrete Traffic Railing Barrier, with Junction Slab, 32" F Shape limits are from Sta. 804+50.00 to Sta. 814+90.00. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:19:57 PM
Question:	21938: Sheet 5 of the Selective Clearing and Grubbing plans (Plan Sheet 664) depicts floating turbidity barrier in the Braden River. However, the only pay item provided for turbidity barrier is for the staked variety (104-12). Will a pay item be added for floating turbidity barrier?	Posted: 4/19/2018 5:00:37 PM
Answer:	Pay item 104-11, Floating Turbidity Barrier, and the associated quantity will be added. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:20:59 PM
Question:	21939: Sheet U-11 and U-12 calls out "Const Concrete Slab Over Exist 18" PVC FM...". One callout is referencing where to start and one where to finish. However, on U-12 there is a callout on the same main showing it as a 36" DIP FM. Please advise where the main transitions from 18" to 36".	Posted: 4/20/2018 9:08:10 AM

Answer:	Please use the location of the SUE test hole TH-DW41 at Station 298+50 BL Survey S.R. 70 for the transition from the 18" to 36" FM.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 4/27/2018 6:45:08 AM
Question:	21942: The table on Sheet SQ-28 includes 127.1 SY of 3" Non-reinforced Ditch Pavement from Sta. 106+00 to Sta. 107+00 and 109.6 SY from Sta. 107+00 to Sta. 108+33. However, this ditch pavement does not appear on the Roadway Plans (Sheets 86, 88), the Cross Sections (Sheet 625), or the Wall W6 plan view (Sheet BW-25). Please clarify.	Posted: 4/20/2018 4:22:59 PM
Answer:	The quantity is correct. The limits of the ditch pavement for the proposed ditch will be added to the plans and sections as part of Revision 2. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:26:07 PM
Question:	21947: Pay Item note #9 on General notes sheet B-9 states that the cost for the Temp Critical Soldier Pile walls are to be included in Pay Item 548-12. The Basis of Estimates states that pay item 548-AA is not intended for Soldier Pile walls. Will you be providing the appropriate pay item for this work?	Posted: 4/23/2018 8:02:06 AM
Answer:	Per Pay Item note #9 on General notes sheet B-9 the payment for soldier pile wall system shall be included in the contract unit price for Pay Item 548-12. There shall not be any additional pay item added for the temporary soldier pile wall system.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 10:33:29 AM
Question:	21963: Sheets SQ-25 and 85 call for an 8' Shoulder Concrete Barrier Wall w/ Sound Wall (0521 72 20) between Sta. 923+40 and 926+20. However, the cross sections on Sheets 647 and 648 depict guardrail instead. Please clarify the nature of the barrier in this location.	Posted: 4/24/2018 10:30:09 AM
Answer:	The barrier is an 8' foot Shoulder Concrete Barrier Wall w/Sound Wall (0521 72 20). The cross sections are revised to show the correct wall. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:24:56 PM
Question:	21964: Sheet 89 shows a Noise Wall left of I-75 SB between Sta. 4452+18.47 and 4454+93.87. The cross sections on Sheets 485 and 486 show this to be mounted on a shoulder barrier, but the height is not clear. Please clarify the height of this wall.	Posted: 4/24/2018 10:35:57 AM
Answer:	The soundwall shall be 8 feet in height. The plans are revised to reference Shoulder Concrete Barrier Wall, F Shaped, with 8' Sound/Noise Wall. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #2 dated 5/1/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/1/2018 4:23:28 PM

Question:	21999: Are the 7, .54" ID, Micro Ducts applicable to Pay Items 630-2-11 and 630-2-12, which is 2" HDPE, for Fin Project ID #201032-2-56-02 (Manatee County School Board IT Relocation); see Pay Item Note 630-2- on Plan Sheet IT-4?	Posted:	4/26/2018 3:42:58 PM
Answer:	Correct, Pay Item Note 3 refers to both Pay Items 630-2-11 and 630-2-12.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/1/2018 10:28:13 AM
Question:	22000: Do Pay Items 630-2-11 and 630-2-12, for Fin Project ID #201032 -2-56-02 (Manatee County School Board IT Relocation), impact any existing sidewalk; see Conduit Note on Plan Sheet IT-4?	Posted:	4/26/2018 3:46:17 PM
Answer:	It is not anticipated that the installation of 630-2-11 and 630-2-12 will impact existing sidewalk. For locations where the conduit crosses existing sidewalk, the conduit is identified as 630-2-12.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/1/2018 10:28:55 AM
Question:	22010: What size is the existing conduit, pull boxes and fiber and how will the removal of same be paid for Fin Project ID #201032-2-56-02 (Manatee County School Board IT Relocation)?	Posted:	4/26/2018 4:14:51 PM
Answer:	The existing pull boxes are typically 2'x3'x3' and the existing conduit contains 7-microducts that meet Pay Item Note 3 on Sheet IT-4. The existing Manatee County IT conduit shares a trench with the other communication conduit impacted by the project (ITS/ATMS). The removal of the existing infrastructure for 201032-2-56-02 is covered under the project pay item for Clearing and Grubbing (110-1) under 201032-2-52-01.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/1/2018 10:27:34 AM
Question:	22039: Where are the CRT anchors (536-85-26) detailed/called out in the plans, which are identified in the summary of quantities, to be at stations 3516+96.25 - 3603+40.91 and at stations 4516+29.98 - 4606+11.32? According to station numbers, both anchors should be on either sheet no. 94 or 100 of the Roadway plans. Please clarify or detail.	Posted:	5/1/2018 3:25:55 PM
Answer:	These two CRT anchors will be deleted from the summary of quantities on SQ-29 and the summary of pay items as part of Revision 3. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #3 dated 5/11/2018.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/11/2018 11:31:01 AM
Question:	22040: I do not see where two runs of guardrail are identified in the summary of quantities. One run is on sheet 104, station 1298+53.30 - 1300+34.50 and the other run on sheet 108, station 1329+40.80 - 1330+40.80. Please clarify.	Posted:	5/1/2018 3:27:33 PM

Answer:	These runs of guardrail, two parallel terminals and two type II anchors will be added to sheet SQ-30 and the summary of pay items will be updated. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #3 dated 5/11/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/11/2018 11:29:23 AM
Question:	22041: Where is the Crash Cushion detailed/called out in the plans, which is identified in the summary of quantities to be at station 232+70.81?	Posted: 5/11/2018 3:27:51 PM
Answer:	This crash cushion will be deleted from the summary of quantities and summary of pay items as part of Revision 3. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #3 dated 5/11/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/11/2018 11:27:47 AM
Question:	22056: The quantity for Electrical Service Wire, Pay Item #639-2-1, on plan sheet IT-24, is 1,800lf; based on the following plan sheet quantities: 348lf #10, 369lf #10, 753lf #6, 102lf #6 and 228lf #6. Please confirm the quantity, for Pay Item #639-2-1, on ITS Plan Sheet IT-24.	Posted: 5/2/2018 4:48:21 PM
Answer:	1,800 lf is correct for pay item 639-2-1 on IT-24.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/7/2018 1:12:46 PM
Question:	22057: Sheet B-8 calls for a Class 5 Applied Finish Coating on the exterior of the 8' soundwall mounted on retaining wall, but there are no aesthetic details provided for the remaining cast-in-place barriers. Please clarify any additional finish details for these walls.	Posted: 5/3/2018 6:50:16 AM
Answer:	A Class 5 Applied Finish Coating shall be applied to the remaining cast-in-place barriers mounted on retaining walls, which will be similar to the 8' foot soundwall mounted on retaining wall.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/10/2018 6:34:40 AM
Question:	22058: There are 3ea 230kV FPL Overhead Electric Transmission lines at Station 289+00 and 1ea 138kV FPL OE Transmission line at Station 331+00. All 4 lines are in conflict with the installation of Sound Wall NW 1 and NW 2. Note 4 on sheet NW-6 states that "The Contractor shall contact power company to De-Energize Overhead Electric over the wall being constructed." Has it been confirmed with FPL if an outage is allowed on a 230kV Transmission line?	Posted: 5/3/2018 7:06:25 AM

Answer: See the executed UWS that was provided with the bid package. By signing the UWS the utility has agreed to de-energize the overhead transmission power during the construction of the sound walls.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/15/2018 2:17:35 PM

Question: 22059: In Reference to the 3ea 230kV FPL OE Transmission lines at Sta 289+00 and 1ea 138kV OE Transmission line at sta 331+00 that plan note 4 on sheet NW-6 states can be De-Energized, there are typically seasonal and time of day restrictions. Are these known at this time?

Posted: 5/3/2018 7:07:12 AM

Answer: The UA/O did not specify any seasonal and time of day restrictions.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/4/2018 10:43:24 AM

Question: 22060: In Reference to the 3ea 230kV FPL OE Transmission lines at Sta 289+00 and 1ea 138kV OE Transmission line at sta 331+00 that plan note 4 on sheet NW-6 states can be De-Energized, are the costs of the outage the responsibility of the contractor? If so, are there estimated costs available?

Posted: 5/3/2018 7:08:03 AM

Answer: The cost to de-energize the transmission circuit is reimbursable to the power company by invoicing FDOT directly. It is not a bid item to the contractor. This answer was verified with District 1 District Utility Administrator.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/3/2018 4:13:12 PM

Question: 22061: Critical Temporary Soldier Pile Wall Data Table on Sheet BW-87 shows the Required Anchor 'Factored' Capacity = 145 Kips, whereas the Soil Anchor Schedule on sheet BW-93 shows the 'Design' Load = 145 Kips. With the term "Design Load" usually considered to be unfactored, please clarify if the 145 kips is factored or unfactored.

Posted: 5/3/2018 7:43:19 AM

Answer: 145 Kips is the factored load.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/10/2018 6:37:08 AM

Question: 22080: Roadway Plan sheet 780, Phase 2 stage 2 shows a median work zone of approximately 31' wide without temporary barrier wall being shown to protect the clear zone requirements. This is needed to install temp critical walls 5 & 6, as well as the installation of the bridge center piers. Please advise as to how the clear zone requirements will be met for the construction of piers while maintaining the number of lanes shown.

Posted: 5/4/2018 9:18:41 AM

Answer:	Roadway plan sheet 780 includes temporary concrete barrier wall within the median extending from station 1311+85 to station 1316+75. Additionally mainline I-75, Phase 2 - Stage 1 plan sheets 736 & 737 includes temporary concrete barrier within the median extending from station 1311+50 to station 1316+15 eastbound and station 1312+50 to station 1316+36 westbound.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/10/2018 6:43:56 AM
Question:	22084: Reference Roadway Plan sheet 105 and Cross section sheets 587-589, it appears the Type 1 flumes S-1011, S-1012, & S-1013 on SR 70 will not drain properly with the embankment and sidewalk being above the discharge point of these flumes; there's no place for this water to go. Please verify that flumes are the proper drainage structure for these locations.	Posted: 5/4/2018 10:24:20 AM
Answer:	The flumes are the proper drainage structures for these locations. The sections from Sta. 1305+00 to 1308+00 RT. are revised to slope toward the infield area, rather than the roadway. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #3 dated 5/11/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/11/2018 11:32:41 AM
Question:	22099: In regards to Item 0000-700-1, Sheets U-11, U-12 & U-28, is it the intent to add a conc. cap only to the forcemain? If so, please revise the detail on U-28 which appears to illustrate undercutting the existing FF and installing bedding stone.	Posted: 5/7/2018 5:34:35 PM
Answer:	The intent is to add both the concrete cap and the bedding stone. The detail does not need to be revised.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/16/2018 8:27:36 AM
Question:	22115: With regard to the special design foundation details on the 0534-72-101 Noise Wall, is this dimension mandatory or would the department allow a variance to this depth if a contractor provides valid and sufficient engineered information that determines and validates the use of lower depth foundations?	Posted: 5/8/2018 2:04:32 PM
Answer:	The bid shall be based on the details provided in the contract documents.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/10/2018 6:42:43 AM
Question:	22140: The typical sections on SR 70 depict an asphalt curb pad under the Type E Curb in some locations but not all. Please confirm that an asphalt curb pad is not required under all Type E Curb rather just at the locations identified.	Posted: 5/9/2018 10:28:49 AM

Answer:	The asphalt curb pad is only required in the areas shown in the typical sections.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/10/2018 8:59:13 AM
Question:	22141: OBG 04, OBG 12 and OBG 13 are all designated as Type B-12.5. Just want to confirm that these all must be Type B-12.5 and that limerock base will not be an option.	Posted: 5/9/2018 10:32:48 AM
Answer:	That is correct. They must all be Type B-12.5.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/16/2018 6:55:49 AM
Question:	22143: For the A-3 select fill, many locations are calling for the select fill (about 1') to be installed on top of the existing ground. In these areas where existing soils are not removed and suitable A-3 select fill is used there seems to be a chance that the infiltration test may fail. If this is the case, how will the Contractor be compensated?	Posted: 5/9/2018 10:49:18 AM
Answer:	The required test values are based on in-situ infiltration test results and drainage design analyses. The infiltration rates are achievable when constructed in accordance with the Project Plans and Specifications. Sheet No. 73 (General Notes) Note 8 of the Dry Retention Pond Notes provides guidance as to what will be required.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/15/2018 2:21:45 PM
Question:	22155: Pay item 700-1, Utilities Design Group - Generic Pay Item 1, has a Unit of Measure ZZ. Looking at Chapter 2 in the Basis of Estimates and Standard Index 001, we see no mention of the abbreviation ZZ. Please confirm that Unit of Measure ZZ is to be used for this pay item.	Posted: 5/10/2018 6:54:33 AM
Answer:	The unit of measure (LF) is listed in the pay item description. For clarification, all generic pay items have the ZZ as measurement.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/15/2018 3:22:34 PM
Question:	22184: On the Roadway Cross-Section Plan Sheets from Sheet #375 to Sheet #561, the plans do not show the embankment volume in the columns. Please provide revised sheets showing the volumes of embankment at the earliest.	Posted: 5/10/2018 5:07:55 PM
Answer:	The embankment volumes are added to cross section sheets. This revision was sent out to all prospective bidders as addendum #4 dated 5/15/2018.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 5/15/2018 4:25:15 PM

Question:	22202: CAN WE USE A WOOD POLE FOR THE TEMPORARY LIGHTING AS LONG AS IT MEETS THE MOUNTING HEIGHT AND HAS A 15' TRUSS TYPE BRACKET ARM AND 400 WATT HPS FOR THE TYPE 1	Posted:	5/11/2018 3:58:44 PM
Answer:	Wood poles are acceptable as long as they are outside the clear zone.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/15/2018 2:19:34 PM
Question:	22271: With the scope of work that's associated with Bid Item 700-1, Utilities Design Group - Generic Pay Item 1, will this Force Main be taken out of service while this work is active?	Posted:	5/16/2018 10:53:46 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:	5/21/2018 3:25:04 AM
Question:	22272: Referencing Bid Item 700-1, does the existing 18" force main need to be restrained?	Posted:	5/16/2018 10:54:56 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:	5/21/2018 3:25:04 AM
Question:	22309: Could the Department please clarify where do we have to include the cost for removal of conduits and pull boxes?	Posted:	5/18/2018 4:11:04 PM
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:	5/21/2018 3:25:04 AM