



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 10/31/2018 1:56:21 PM

District Address: District 2 Construction Office, located at 1109 South Marion Avenue, Lake City, FL 32025

District Phone: (386) 961-7532

Proposal: T2717
Project: 422938-6-52-01
Letting Date: 10/31/2018
Location: CENTRAL OFFICE
Description: SR 23 (FIRST COAST EXPRESSWAY)

Question: 22958: Can the department provide .GEN files for existing and design surfaces? Posted: 8/2/2018 10:35:08 AM

Answer: .GEN files are not available. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 8/14/2018 2:42:16 PM

Question: 23045: Please confirm 400 2 4 Superstructure Concrete Class II, Diaphragms quantities. Posted: 8/6/2018 10:47:56 AM

Answer: The Diaphragm quantities have been confirmed. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 8/14/2018 11:41:59 AM

Question: 23069: Is there anything preventing the contractor from excavating test holes prior to the bid opening? Posted: 8/8/2018 12:39:16 PM

Answer: The Department has no objection to the Bidders performing test holes within the limits of the project prior to bid opening. However, test hole locations must be permitted via a General Use Permit (Form 850-040-05) and follow all General Provisions. Sufficient information must be provided including, but not limited to, proposed test hole locations, access, and proposed methods for restoring disturbed properties to their original state. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 8/14/2018 1:30:16 PM

Question:	23080: Ref: Utility Plans for Water & Sewer Plan Sheet U-8 & U-12 for water & sewer pipes calls for 18x12 Tap on existing 18" line and installation of new 18" pipe. Please confirm if Tap size will be 18x12 or 18x18 for both Water & Sewer Plan Sheet U-13 & U-15 for Sewer FM calls for 16x12 tap on existing 16" line & installation of new 16" line. Please confirm if Tap size is 16x12 or 16x16 for sewer.	Posted:	8/13/2018 9:18:50 AM
Answer:	The tapping sleeve sizes are as follows: U-8 / U-12: 18"x12" NPWM, 18"x12" FM. U-13 / U-15: 16"x12" FM, 12"x12" WM.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/14/2018 3:03:42 PM
Question:	23087: Can you confirm that there is no Class 5 Finish requirement for this project.	Posted:	8/15/2018 2:18:15 PM
Answer:	Class 5 Finish is not required on retaining walls, bridges, or shoulder-mounted noise walls. Class 5 Finish is required on the ground-mounted noise walls, See Revision 1.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/31/2018 4:14:25 PM
Question:	23109: Article 7-16 includes three Wage Rate Decisions. Is FL152 Heavy to be used for Section 0006 Utilities, FL244 Building for Section 0007 Architectural, and FL 205 Highway for all other work?	Posted:	8/22/2018 10:06:11 AM
Answer:	The wage tables apply as follows: * Heavy table - work involving bridge over navigable waters for which Coast Guard permit is required * Building table - work involving the vertical structures (buildings) which house various components * Highway table - work involving all roadway construction	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/23/2018 10:09:55 AM
Question:	23134: Does the Department have a Form or Computation Book that provides details of how the allowable project time, 2400 days, was determined? If so is it available?	Posted:	8/23/2018 2:17:29 PM
Answer:	The requested files are available from CPP On-Line Ordering, for information only.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/31/2018 4:12:27 PM
Question:	23158: Can you confirm if FDOT will be retaining the risk for Named Windstorm losses?	Posted:	8/28/2018 1:03:13 PM

Answer:	See FDOT Specifications 7-14 and 8-6.1.1.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/30/2018 10:10:07 AM
Question:	23192: Are the tapping sleeve sizes, which were included in the response to question 23080 shown anywhere in the plans? If so, where? If not, can a revision be issued to include this information?	Posted:	8/30/2018 10:46:44 AM
Answer:	Tapping sleeve sizes are shown on Sheets U-8, U-12, U-13, and U-15, of the Utility Plans (422938-6-56-01).	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/31/2018 11:24:41 AM
Question:	23199: Can the Department provide the geotech report used to generate the surcharge and wick drain design?	Posted:	8/31/2018 9:17:01 AM
Answer:	The requested information is available from CPP On-Line Ordering website, for information only.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/10/2018 6:41:43 AM
Question:	23200: Can the Department provide the anticipated settlement of each surcharge location?	Posted:	8/31/2018 9:17:46 AM
Answer:	The Bidder should anticipate a minimum of 9 inches of settlement between STA 1190+00 and 1193+00.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/10/2018 10:44:37 AM
Question:	23229: At the mandatory pre-bid meeting there were some cost saving initiative (CSI) exclusions discussed. Please provide an exact list of those that will indeed not be considered as a CSI or contract modification post award.	Posted:	9/4/2018 10:10:25 AM
Answer:	There are six CSI options that would not be considered. See Question 23233.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/10/2018 10:41:32 AM
Answer:	There are six CSI options that would not be considered. See Question 23233.	Status:	ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted:	9/10/2018 10:40:16 AM

Answer:	See Question 23233.	Status:	ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted:	9/7/2018 8:37:57 AM
Question:	23230: On sheet number 1777 regarding the Temporary Traffic Control Plan Restricted Area, there is a note that states "Do not to enter or perform work within the restricted area for a period of one year after notice to proceed, unless otherwise authorized by the engineer". What is the reason the contractor cannot access this area sooner? What is the possibility that the contractor will be allowed to access this area earlier than one year after NTP?	Posted:	9/4/2018 10:18:40 AM
Answer:	Due to the current ongoing project, the Department cannot provide any assurance that access will be allowed earlier than indicated in the contract documents.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/21/2018 8:52:46 AM
Question:	23231: Can the department please provide the full Geotechnical Report produced by Terracon to allow the contractor to fully analyze the existing ground conditions?	Posted:	9/4/2018 10:19:31 AM
Answer:	The requested information is available from CPP On-Line Ordering website, for information only.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/7/2018 11:22:08 AM
Question:	23233: At the Pre-Bid meeting held by the department on August 22, 2018 at 1:30 PM, it was stated that there were four CSI options that would not be considered. Can you please confirm that the following potential CSI's will not be allowed: 1)Changes to horizontal or vertical roadway geometry; 2)Changes to fill embankment slopes (steeper than 1:3); 3)Elimination of full-depth diaphragms; 4)Pre-cast culverts on CD-C30 and CD-C45	Posted:	9/4/2018 10:22:38 AM
Answer:	The Department has identified six CSIs that will be excluded from consideration: 1) Changes to roadway horizontal and vertical design 2) Changes to 1:3 embankment slopes (steeper than 1:3) or removal of MSE walls 3) Elimination of full-depth diaphragms 4) Pre-cast culverts for CD-C30 and CD-C45 5) Changes or relocations of utility relocations to remove steel utility casings 6) Changes or relocations of ITS conduits to avoid directional drilling	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/10/2018 11:04:05 AM
Answer:	Confirmed.	Status:	ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted:	9/4/2018 4:23:14 PM

Answer:	There are six CSI options that would not be considered. The following potential CSI's will not be allowed: 1)Changes to horizontal or vertical roadway geometry; 2)Changes to fill embankment slopes (steeper than 1:3); 3)Elimination of full-depth diaphragms; 4)Pre-cast culverts on CD-C30 and CD-C45; 5) Elimination of utility casings and relocations; 6) Relocating proposed ITS conduits from directional boring to hanging on the bridge or locating within the traffic railing.	Status: ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted: 9/10/2018 10:37:59 AM
Question:	23282: The "Performance Turf" specification section 570 clearly puts the responsibility of turf establishment on the contractor. If that is the case, would FDOT considering eliminating the "Prepared Soil Layer" bid item and requirement while still constructing the earthwork to the proposed lines and grades as established in the plans? This would result in a substantial cost savings to FDOT.	Posted: 9/7/2018 3:22:44 PM
Answer:	No.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/11/2018 11:11:35 AM
Question:	23313: As FRP pipe is allowed by Specification 948 for use in bridge drainage systems in lieu of PVC, will it be allowed for use on this project?	Posted: 9/11/2018 4:39:39 PM
Answer:	The use of FRP for bridge drainage systems will not be prohibited. The use of alternative pipe materials will be subject to review and approval by the Department.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/13/2018 6:50:06 AM
Question:	23331: The Design High Water Elevation has only been provided for some of the MSE walls (1, 2, 5-8, and 19-23), indicating a potential need for coarse aggregate backfill per Specification 548-2.6.1. Please confirm, for the remaining walls, that the Design High Water Elevation is not anticipated to be "above the lowest adjacent ground surface".	Posted: 9/12/2018 3:49:37 PM
Answer:	Please see Revision.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/19/2018 11:49:45 AM
Question:	23332: Sheets SB-7 through SB-12 specify a 36" diameter for the noise wall auger cast piles. Please clarify whether or not the intent is to construct using the Low Clearance Option detailed in Standard Plans Index 534-200.	Posted: 9/12/2018 3:50:09 PM
Answer:	The auger cast pile size for Noise Wall 1 will be reduced from 36" to 30". Refer to Revision 3.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/2/2018 4:51:44 PM

Question:	23337: What will be the acceptable means of attaching the 2 JPA utility schedules of value? Is a hand written converted to pdf and then attached to the EBS file acceptable or is excel the preferred format? If excel is the preferred format, please make those files available to us.	Posted:	9/13/2018 7:44:09 AM
Answer:	The schedule of values document is available in CPP On-Line Ordering. Complete the pdf document (handwritten) and scan/upload a copy with your bid.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/13/2018 2:20:52 PM
Question:	23359: On Sheet SB-3 (revision 1) of the noise wall plan set there is a table showing that precast post caps are not required. However, Note (2) below the table specifies a cap color. Please clarify whether or not caps are required for the posts.	Posted:	9/13/2018 4:31:23 PM
Answer:	Caps are not required.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/18/2018 7:44:57 AM
Question:	23360: Will there be mobilization items provided for the (2) utility work JPA schedules of value?	Posted:	9/13/2018 4:35:22 PM
Answer:	No. Costs for mobilization related to the utility work performed for the 422938-6-56-01 will be paid for under Pay Item 0101-1 Mobilization for the 422938-6-52-01 project.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/17/2018 2:51:31 PM
Question:	23413: Could you issue the permits obtained for construction access of bridges at Bradley Creek, Black Creek, Grog Tributary and Grog Branch?	Posted:	9/18/2018 9:21:19 AM
Answer:	Permits obtained by the Department are available on the permit website. See FDOT Specification 7-2.2 for the website link.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/18/2018 1:49:29 PM
Question:	23456: Does the Department have a Form or Computation Book that provides details of how the allowable project time of 2000 days as revised by addendum/amendment no. 3, was determined? If so is it available and will the department make it available?	Posted:	9/20/2018 8:43:23 AM
Answer:	No.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/23/2018 9:03:25 AM

Question: 23457: Addendum/Amendment No. 3 modified the quantity of item 102-60 which is based on an Each Day (ED) unit of measure. The assumption is that the quantity of this item was revised because the contract time was reduced. There are 7 other pay items on this project with the ED unit of measure (102-74-1, 102-74-2, 102-76, 102-99, 105-150-1 and 102-150-2). Will the quantities of those items also be adjusted now that the contract time has been reduced?

Answer: No.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/27/2018 9:51:00 AM

Question: 23579: Addendum 4 added "50 - Year Design High Water Elevations" to the Permanent MSE Retaining Wall System Data Table pages (those that were missing this info). In addition, Addendum 4 added a "SHW" elevation to each MSE Wall Control Drawing. The "50 - Year Design High Water Elevations" and the "SHW" elevations are different - with the "SHW" elevations higher. Which elevation should be used to determine the coarse aggregate backfill requirements & Type D-2 geotextile fabric per the 548 specification? Further, this elevation affects the design of the MSE walls.

Answer: Please see Specifications 548-2.6.1.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/9/2018 8:48:25 AM

Question: 23599: Will there be any plans provided for the temporary lighting.

Answer: No. Refer to Sheet 1766 for the minimum requirements.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/12/2018 7:15:34 AM

Question: 23644: Will FDOT/RS&H be responsible for 3D deliverable updates associated with plan revisions and/or modifications?

Answer: FDOT will be responsible for 3D deliverable updates associated with Plan Revisions.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/23/2018 9:02:54 AM

Question: 23726: The fuel calculation for Regular Excavation used to determine the Fuel Factor for Contracts let January 2013 forward assumes 60% hauled and placed onsite, 10% dozer push and 30% hauled off. However, this project has a different balance from the aforementioned percentages. Would the FDOT consider adjusting the Fuel Factor for Pay Item 120 1 "Regular Excavation" to the Fuel Factor used for Contracts let between 01/01/07 and 12/31/12?

Posted: 10/23/2018 4:19:50 PM

Answer: Fuel factors will not be adjusted.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/25/2018 4:45:03 PM

Question: 23738: Sheet BW 84, Section FF, is this applicable to the following:

MSE Wall 9 Sta.0+00 to 1+25.18 and Sta. 2+99.05 to 3+94.07
MSE Wall 10 Sta. 0+00 to 1+21 and Sta. 2+94.24 to 3+96.14
MSE Wall 14 Sta. 6+49.61 to 7+59.82
MSE Wall 21 Sta. 0+00 to 1+09.36
MSE Wall 22 Sta. 13+11.25 to 14+19.44
MSE Wall 23 Sta. 0+00 to 0+72.60
MSE Wall 24 Sta. 0+00 to 1+03.02 and Sta. 4+26.21 to 5+80.19
MSE Wall 25 Sta. 3+15.51 to 4+96.87
MSE Wall 26 Sta. 0+00 to 0+93.45

Section FF has a fence, moment slab, and gutter. That does match what is show at these locations on the elevation sheets for the respective walls. Please advise what is applicable and what is not.

Posted: 10/24/2018 11:09:36 AM

Answer: Refer to Question 23745.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/26/2018 9:28:09 AM

Question: 23739: Is burning of the cleared debris allowed?

Posted: 10/24/2018 11:14:56 AM

Answer: Refer to Specifications 7-1.1, 7-20, and 110-9.2.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/25/2018 4:33:21 PM

Question: 23742: Regarding Maintenance of Traffic and Temp Lighting at Henley Road, Sheet 1766 states, "Temporary Lighting is the responsibility of the Contractor. Submit photometric calculations for midblock crossing."

There is currently no street lighting on Henley Road in this area.

Can this requirement be removed from the contract?

Posted: 10/24/2018 1:49:49 PM

Answer:	No. Please refer to Sheet 1766 for the minimum requirements.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/25/2018 4:42:17 PM
Question:	23743: The provided settlement criteria for the precast box culvert option indicates a link slab will be required for CD27, CD31 and CD33. Please confirm this is accurate.	Posted:	10/24/2018 1:56:51 PM
Answer:	See Standard Plans Index 400-291, Sheet 5 of 5.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/26/2018 9:37:42 AM
Question:	23744: There is approximately 2,500,000 CY of pond excavation on this project. That effort will require a monumental dewatering effort. Will the FDOT be securing the dewatering permit for this project?	Posted:	10/24/2018 2:03:43 PM
Answer:	Permits obtained by the Department are available on the permit website. See FDOT Specification 7-2.2 for the website link.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/26/2018 9:29:02 AM
Question:	23745: PLEASE DISREGARD QUESTION 23738 Sheet BW 84, Section FF, is this applicable to the following: MSE Wall 9 Sta.0+00 to 1+25.18 and Sta. 2+99.05 to 3+94.07 MSE Wall 10 Sta. 0+00 to 1+21 and Sta. 2+94.24 to 3+96.14 MSE Wall 14 Sta. 6+49.61 to 7+59.82 MSE Wall 21 Sta. 0+00 to 1+09.36 MSE Wall 22 Sta. 13+11.25 to 14+19.44 MSE Wall 23 Sta. 0+00 to 0+72.60 MSE Wall 24 Sta. 0+00 to 1+03.02 and Sta. 4+26.21 to 5+80.19 MSE Wall 25 Sta. 3+15.51 to 4+96.87 MSE Wall 26 Sta. 0+00 to 0+93.45 Section FF has a fence, moment slab, and gutter. That does NOT match what is shown at these locations on the elevation sheets for the respective walls. Please advise what is applicable and what is not.	Posted:	10/24/2018 2:11:09 PM
Answer:	Bid plans as shown.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/26/2018 3:40:10 PM
Question:	23749: For pay items 711-14-560 and 711-14-570 will you want us to install these items with border or block contrast?	Posted:	10/24/2018 3:00:37 PM
Answer:	Block contrast.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	10/26/2018 3:23:36 PM

Question: 23750: Specification 548-8.6, Compressible Free Draining Seal, states, "Seal all joints between panels of reinforced concrete panel MSE walls with compressible free draining material to prevent plant growth from seeds or spores that may be in the joints or transported to the joints by wind or rain."

Posted: 10/24/2018 3:58:49 PM

Is this requirement applicable to this project? If so who is an approved supplier of this product?

Answer: Yes. Check the APL list for approved suppliers.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/26/2018 3:40:34 PM

Question: 23751: The cross sectional area and footing depth scaled from the cross sections does not match the detail on sheet BW-79. Please provide the Summary Of Quantities (SQ) sheet detailing the Gravity Wall quantities along the 700 foot length.

Posted: 10/24/2018 4:10:17 PM

Answer: Refer to Sheet BQ27-2.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/26/2018 1:09:28 PM

Question: 23752: Black Creek Bridges No. 710124 and 710125, what is the reason for the required preforming of piles in Piers 2 to 6? This is going to be a significant effort, can it be eliminated?

Posted: 10/24/2018 4:37:30 PM

Answer: Refer to the Structures Geotechnical Report "SR 23 Over Black Creek - Bridge Nos. 710124 & 710125" and Specification 455-5.10.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/26/2018 10:02:29 AM