



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 9/26/2018 8:42:38 AM

District Address: District 3 Construction Office, located at 1074 Highway 90 East, Chipley, FL 32428

District Phone: (850) 415-9713

Proposal: T3702

Project: 424464-5-52-01

Letting Date: 9/26/2018

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 388

Question: 23075: Please repost all the previous questions and answers from the original T3670 solicitation number

Posted: 8/10/2018 10:38:39 AM

Answer: See Attached.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

The following bid questions were submitted on Proposal T3670 (SR 388 from SR 79 to E of Northwest Florida Beaches International Airport) which was withdrawn from the June 13, 2018 Letting.

Posted: 8/31/2018 10:45:54 AM

This project was rescheduled to be Let September 26, 2018 as Proposal T3702. Questions previously submitted on T3670 are being provided with responses based off contract plans provided for Proposal T3702.

Document: 7688303: T3670 Bid Questions.pdf

T3670 Bid Questions

Question: 23076: Is the property available for the contractor to dig test holes? Who is the contact person to arrange this, if any.

Posted: 8/10/2018 10:40:31 AM

Answer: Yes, site investigation is allowed within the limits of the FDOT right of way. However, no test holes should be conducted on the FDOT roadway or within the clear zone without written approval from the FDOT. Any type of proposed activity within the roadway or clear zone will require the use of appropriate traffic control devices. Any other areas of the FDOT right of way are available for site investigation without written approval as long as the FDOT is contacted 48 hours in advance of the investigation. Please contact Bobby Ellis at 850-258-7139 to provide notification or to seek written approval. All other notifications/approvals (i.e. Sunshine one call, FAA, etc.) are the responsibility of the contractor to obtain

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 8/13/2018 8:55:45 AM

Question:	23100: The specifications on payment for the Vertical Drainage Wicks states the quantity to be paid will be the plan quantity in linear feet installed and accepted. Is the quantity to be paid plan quantity or actual installed quantity?	Posted:	8/20/2018 8:40:40 AM
Answer:	Vertical Drainage Wicks will be paid for as actual installed and accepted quantity. The reference to plan quantity in the Specifications will be revised through an addendum forthcoming.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/7/2018 10:32:20 AM
Question:	23163: 1) Will there be WGU units required for the tone wire for the fiber optics. 2) If there are WGU units required will they go in every pull box or every 3rd pull box.	Posted:	8/28/2018 3:29:46 PM
Answer:	1) WGU's are required for the tone wire. 2) Use one at each pull/splice box.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/13/2018 10:44:16 AM
Question:	23182: The signal plans call for F&I new mast arm assemblies and new traffic signal equipment at SR 388 & SR 79. However, there isn't a pay items to remove any of the existing items like shallow pole removal, controller assembly removal, electrical service removal, etc. Please advise.	Posted:	8/29/2018 11:19:04 AM
Answer:	This project includes constructing a new intersection at SR 388 & SR 79. There are no existing mast arms to be removed.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	8/31/2018 8:32:31 AM
Question:	23183: For pay item #633-1-123 F&I 72 count fiber cable, there are no pay items listed for fiber splicing & all components needed to connect to new traffic signal cabinet. This would include a drop fiber, ethernet switch, splice enclosures, splices, etc. Please advise.	Posted:	8/29/2018 11:24:19 AM
Answer:	The plans are to provide the interconnect fiber optic lines and conduit to allow for a future connection to the new signal, but not to connect to the signal at this time.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/6/2018 3:11:07 PM

Question: 23184: Pay items 102-104 / 102-107-1 are not included in plans. Was this the intent of the design, because there is an existing functioning traffic signal at SR 388 & SR 79.

Posted: 8/29/2018 11:34:25 AM

Please advise.

Answer: This project constructs a new intersection of SR 388 & SR 79 (over 1 mile north of the existing intersection) so temporary signals (102-104) and temporary detection (102-107-1) are not needed.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 8/31/2018 8:30:53 AM

Question: 23205: Please clarify the intent of Note 6 on sheet 460 stating "No separate payment will be made for removal of geosynthetic reinforcement". Since this material will be installed near natural ground surface and below surcharge areas where proposed roadway is higher than natural ground, it wouldn't be practical to remove any. Is there any areas that it is anticipated it would need to be removed.

Posted: 8/31/2018 10:48:15 AM

Answer: It is anticipated that sections of the geosynthetic reinforcement will need to be removed to install the permanent drainage structures located within surcharge areas after the settlement monitoring period is complete. The intent of this note is to alert the Contractor that no separate payment will be made for areas where removal of the geosynthetic reinforcement is needed.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/13/2018 10:43:50 AM

Question: 23206: Can the geotechnical reports be provided and what is the expected subsidence at each surcharge location?

Posted: 8/31/2018 10:54:01 AM

Answer: Table 8 (PDF pg 38) in the Final Geotechnical Roadway Report provides settlement values based on maximum anticipated settlement at limited locations within each surcharge area. This table includes estimated short-term and long-term settlement values. Reports will be provided. See attached.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/10/2018 2:20:24 PM

Document: 7713707: 424464-5_Final_Geotechnical_Report_SR-388_Roadway.pdf

Final Geotech Report

Question: 23208: Are EDCs required? If so, who pays for the EDCs the contractor for the State?

Posted: 8/31/2018 12:11:06 PM

Answer: EDCs are not required for this project.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/13/2018 10:42:27 AM

Question: 23237: What is the anticipated subsidence during construction of the surcharge and what is the anticipated subsidence after constructing surcharge to final grade is complete? Posted: 9/4/2018 3:15:51 PM

Answer: Table 8 (PDF pg 38) in the Final Geotechnical Roadway Report provides settlement values based on maximum anticipated settlement at limited locations within each surcharge area. This Table 8 (PDF pg 38) in the Final Geotechnical Roadway Report provides settlement values based on maximum anticipated settlement at limited locations within each surcharge area. This table includes estimated short-term and long-term settlement values. table includes estimated short-term and long-term settlement values. See Geotech Report attached. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/10/2018 2:21:45 PM

Document: 7713724: 424464-5_Final_Geotechnical_Report_SR-388_Roadway.pdf

Final Geotech report

Question: 23273: Is this traffic signal being built down the road to the north from the one that is there now. Posted: 9/7/2018 7:49:18 AM

Answer: Yes, there is a new intersection being constructed north of the existing intersection. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/7/2018 10:32:50 AM

Question: 23274: Do they really want 3 GPS detectors for the signal priority please advise. Posted: 9/7/2018 7:51:23 AM

Answer: Only one detector will be used at this intersection. This will decrease the quantity needed from 3 to 1 for Pay Item 0663-1-122. A revision is forthcoming. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/20/2018 8:37:23 AM

Question: 23281: The bridge mount only shows one 2" conduit will the tone wire go in the 2" with the fiber optic cable. Posted: 9/7/2018 3:19:55 PM

Answer: The tone wire would terminate on the west side of the bridge, then resume on the east side. It is used to locate the fiber optic conduit, and is not needed over the bridge. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/13/2018 10:42:02 AM

Question: 23305: Sheet B1-10, note 13 states that "All preplanned splices shall be mechanical". Will the EOR allow preplanned splices to be implemented as detailed in Index 455-002 "DRIVABLE PREPLANNED PRESTRESSED PRECAST PILE SPLICE DETAIL"? Posted: 9/11/2018 1:54:40 PM

Answer: No, all preplanned pile splices shall be mechanical. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/13/2018 9:37:58 AM

Question: 23367: 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: 9/14/2018 3:04:32 PM

Answer: The Department will not revise the fuel factors for this contract. The referenced distribution of the work was based on analysis of a normalized project. Individual projects may vary from that analysis. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/17/2018 8:35:43 AM

Question: 23368: The geotechnical report provided as part of the Questions & Answers depicts on Table 8 an anticipated total settlement With Surcharge of 76.8", 219.7", 15", 18.1" and 49.2" at their respective surcharge locations. If this is correct and based on the areas of each location, it is anticipated that there could be about 300,000 cy of additional material needed due to settlement with the most notable area being at STA 536+50. This area alone could need about 170,000 cy due to the 219.7" settlement. At this location, the anticipated settlement is greater than the total combined height of embankment and surcharge. Can it be confirmed that the anticipated settlements given are correct, especially at this location? Posted: 9/14/2018 3:19:12 PM

Answer: The settlements shown in the plans are anticipated settlements at specific locations. The average settlement over the surcharge areas was used to calculate the amount of needed earthwork. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/20/2018 7:55:37 AM

Question: 23369: In the geotechnical report provided in the Questions and Answers, is the Short-Term Settlement on Table 8 the anticipated settlement while installing the surcharge and is the Long-Term Settlement the anticipated settlement after reaching the top of the surcharge template? Posted: 9/14/2018 3:34:30 PM

Answer: Yes. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/19/2018 8:27:51 AM

Question: 23389: Would a woven geotextile be acceptable in lieu of an extruded geogrid for the Geosynthetic Reinforced Foundation Over Soft Soils if it meets the strength requirements listed on plan sheet 460 and listed on the APL under Type R-2? Posted: 9/17/2018 8:18:41 AM

Answer: No, Geogrid is required. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/20/2018 7:57:09 AM

Question: 23417: Per the landscaping plans, Crushed Shell Mulch is not readily available locally in this market. Is there an alternative material that the Department would welcome in place of the crushed shell mulch? Posted: 9/18/2018 1:35:09 PM

Answer: No, Crushed Shell Mulch is important to the overall aesthetics of this project. The landscape design for the roundabout shown in the plans was coordinated and approved with The Airport Authority. Crushed Shell mulch has been used on previous FDOT landscaping projects in and around Bay County. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/19/2018 3:31:53 PM

Question: 23418: It appears the the irrigation plan set seems incomplete with what appears to be small sections missing on LD-12 and LD-13. There is an irrigation schedule with the materials but the actual plan seems like it is missing information. Are there any texts that should appear on those sheets to indicate irrigation notes? Posted: 9/18/2018 1:40:05 PM

Answer: Sheets LD-12 and LD-13 were missing the proposed irrigation information. These sheets have been updated to include the needed info attached below. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/20/2018 8:25:14 AM

Document: 7752761: 424464-5-52-01 Landscape Plans LD12 - LD13.pdf

Landscape

Question: 23432: TSP 1 references horizontal strip drains but plans do not detail if horizontal drains are actually required. Can you please clarify if horizontal strip drains are to be installed? If horizontal strip drains are required, under which pay item will they be paid? Posted: 9/19/2018 10:24:34 AM

Answer: Yes, horizontal strip drains are to be installed. The Horizontal Strip Drains are to be paid for under 442-70 Vertical Drainage Wicks. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/21/2018 10:59:15 AM

Question: 23433: Will burning be allowed on the project? Posted: 9/19/2018 10:28:55 AM

Answer: All debris disposal shall be in accordance with Standard Specification 110-9.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/19/2018 12:23:41 PM

Question: 23446: Reference structure plans B1-01 -> B1-91, has the bridge designer considered how much room there is between these 2 structures?

Posted: 9/19/2018 3:46:39 PM

Sheet No. 781 delineates the wetlands, allowable construction area outboard of these bridges is approximately 12'-6". Based on the allowable area depicted on this sheet, there is virtually no room outboard to put any sort of crane needed to build these bridges. Therefore, the only way to build these structures is down the middle; however, there is only 22'-6" between the bridges. That is not enough room to have a crane large enough to set a FIB 72 135LF (148,905 LBS ~ 74.45 TONS).

Answer: The constructability of these bridges was reviewed during design, and it was determined that there are multiple possibilities for construction means and methods available to the Contractor. It is noted that barge mounted cranes could be used for setting the beams for some of the spans. It is also noted that the median provides approximately 25 feet clear distance between the exterior beams of these parallel bridges. It is further noted that the longer spans are staggered between the two bridges, which allows an open space in the adjacent bridge as construction progresses; and that the end spans are shorter spans.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/21/2018 8:57:21 AM

Question: 23491: Table 8 of the Geotechnical Report provides Total Settlement measured in Inches at 5 locations

Posted: 9/20/2018 3:11:54 PM

Station 420+20 provides settlement data for Surcharge Area from STA 411+00 to STA 423+00 with total Settlement of 76.8"
Station 548+00 provides settlement data for Surcharge Area from STA 537+00 to STA 549+00 with total Settlement of 219.7"
Settlement data for Surcharge Area from STA 588+50 to STA 616+50 provides settlement data at Station 598+50 of 15", STA 599+50 of 18.1" and STA 604+00 of 49.2"

Based on information provided in Geotechnical Report it appears that a large volume of select material will be needed for the "Total Settlement". Since no allowance will be made for subsidence of material below the existing ground line (as defined), should volume of Select Material needed in our bid be calculated using the entire footprint of each Surcharge Area times the Total Settlement given? If not, please provide a volume of Select Fill needed for "Total Settlement" for all Surcharge Areas

Answer: The settlements shown in the plans are anticipated settlements at specific locations. The average settlement over the surcharge areas was used to calculate the amount of needed earthwork.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/21/2018 8:19:38 AM

Question: 23507: In response to your answer on question no. 23491, we interpret the specifications to state the contractor is to add surcharge to the original surcharge elevation as the ground subsides and no allowance has been made for it in your original bid quantities and no overrun will be paid for this added material. If this is the case, what "average" settlement in all areas should the contractor allow for in our bid that will not be paid for?

Posted: 9/21/2018 11:01:25 AM

Answer: The payment for all Surcharge activities described in the TSP is covered in T120-7 "Basis of Payment". Surcharge Embankment is not a plan quantity and is paid for as Cubic Yards.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 9/21/2018 2:30:46 PM