



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 4/24/2019 9:45:35 AM

District Address: District 5 Construction Office, located at 719 South Woodland Blvd, Deland, FL 32720

District Phone: (386) 943-5350

Proposal: T5642

Project: 240200-3-52-01

Letting Date: 4/24/2019

Location: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 46

---

Question: 24619: I was unable to download two of the files - error message stating the page is not working - the two files in question are the TSP 612 & TSP 633. Posted: 1/31/2019 8:11:00 AM

---

Answer: Technical Special Provisions T612 and T633 are attached. Both can also be found within the Specifications Package. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 2/1/2019 10:56:29 AM

---

Document: 8221427: 24020035201-TSP612, Device Integration and Testing.pdf

TSP T612

---

Document: 8221440: 24020035201-TSP633, Multi-Conductor Comm Cable.pdf

TSP T633

---

Question: 24751: Phase IA Typical Section on Sheet 148 shows 24' of existing roadway with 25' of temporary asphalt. The corresponding plan sheets and cross sections, sheets 152 & 164 respectfully, show temporary pavement over existing pavement. The contract documents do not provide details. Is this overbuild? Is milling required? This condition exists in several areas in Phase I. Please advise. Posted: 2/11/2019 8:11:51 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1. Also, see Section 102 of the FDOT Standard Specifications. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/15/2019 10:51:27 AM

---

Question: 24752: Phase I of the Traffic Control Plan does not provide enough proposed pavement width to accommodate Phase II inside turn lanes and low-profile barrier for SR46 EB. Overlaying the two Phases show a gap of approximately 11' in some areas. Please advise. Posted: 2/11/2019 8:12:47 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/15/2019 11:21:29 AM

---

Question: 24753: Please provide specific limits of the Temporary Lane Separators shown in Phase I. The circles depicting the Temporary Lane Separators do not show the start and end of each run. Posted: 2/11/2019 8:14:06 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/15/2019 11:22:34 AM

---

Question: 24754: Please confirm that the Temporary Asphalt shown in Phase IV was previously placed in Phase II. Posted: 2/11/2019 8:14:45 AM

---

Answer: Yes. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/22/2019 10:19:13 AM

---

Question: 24755: Typical section on sheet 10 shows overbuild, and overbuild is shown in the Summary of Quantities on sheets SQ-18 & SQ-19. Please provide table summarizing how Overbuild volume was calculated. Posted: 2/11/2019 8:15:30 AM

---

Answer: This information is located in the CADD.zip file under calculations. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 2/22/2019 10:21:00 AM

---

Question: 24769: Please confirm that the Widening Overlap Detail on Sheet 13 does not apply to the inside widening and left roadway per Note 1. Posted: 2/11/2019 1:10:37 PM

---

Answer: The Widening Overlay Details on Sheet 13 apply to the eastbound outside widening only. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/8/2019 9:08:54 AM

---

Question: 24851: All proposed new base from Sta. 225+25 to 259+50 is shown to be Base Group 10, B12.5 only. The typical sections do not indicate asphalt curb pads are required for this area, only standard stabilization. Will standard stabilized curb pads be permitted for this area or will asphalt curb pads be required? Please clarify this issue and provide details if this will be required.

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1.

---

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/15/2019 11:26:59 AM

---

Question: 24903: Please provide the existing asphalt coring data for this project.

---

Answer: Coring data is available for reference at the following website: <https://www.fdot.gov/materials/pavement/coringdata/D5/77/default.shtm>

---

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/8/2019 9:12:14 AM

---

Question: 24904: On Plan Sheet No. 10 it states "Overbuild Type SP Structural Course (Traffic C) (Varies)". On Plan Sheet No. 13 it states "Widening Overlap Detail 1 Overbuild (Varies)" and "Widening Overlap Detail 2 Overbuild (Varies)". On Plan Sheet SQ-18 and SQ-19 it states "0334-1-13 Superpave Asphaltic Conc, Traffic C Overbuild". It shows the SP asphalt overbuild quantities for each proposed location. Please provide the detailed computations (i.e. typical sections, existing cross slopes, proposed cross slopes, overbuild thicknesses at each location, etc.) that shows how this overbuild asphalt tonnage was calculated.

---

Answer: This information is located in the CADD.zip file under calculations.

---

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/8/2019 9:13:35 AM

---

Question: 24963: Item 1055-31-120, summary of quantities sheet U-3 indicates there are 2 EA 20" elbows on sheet U-8, there is no 20" pipe on sheet U-8, please provide revised plans or location of this work if to be required or review and revise bid item quantity accordingly.

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1.

---

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/15/2019 12:14:46 PM

---

Question: 24965: Item 105-42-206, summary of quantities sheet U-3 indicates there is 158' LF of HDPE 6" on sheet U-9, we are unable to locate any 6" HDPE pipe constructed on sheet U-9, please provide revised plans or location of this work if to be required or review and revise bid item quantity accordingly. Posted: 2/26/2019 9:15:37 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/15/2019 12:15:33 PM

---

Question: 24966: On utility plan sheet U-14 at app. Sta. 240+83 +/- 193' LF of 10" HDPE Directional Bore is shown to be constructed. This item and quantity does not appear in the sheet U-3 summary of quantities or in the bid quantities. Please review this issue and revise the summary of quantities and bid item quantity accordingly. Posted: 2/26/2019 9:19:56 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/15/2019 12:15:38 PM

---

Question: 24970: Fire Hydrant Relocate; There are no new 6" gate valves shown to be installed on the new water mains for the fire hydrant relocations. This will require full service shut down of the new water mains to reinstall (relocate) the existing fire hydrant and 6" gate valves onto the new water main after clearance. Will this be accepted or will new 6" gate valves be required to eliminate the full service shut down of the new water mains? If new 6" gate valves will be required for these relocations please review this issue and revise the bid item quantity accordingly or provide details how these relocation connections are to be made. Posted: 2/26/2019 9:29:17 AM

---

Answer: Refer to Technical Special Provision for Seminole County Utility Relocations. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/15/2019 9:24:34 AM

---

Question: 24971: The specifications state that all water required for flushing and testing of the new utility mains and the cost of this water will be the responsibility of the Contractor. What are the costs/rates for this water from the service provider? If this cost is to be paid for by the Contractor please provide these rates so costs can be included accordingly. Posted: 2/26/2019 9:39:49 AM

---

Answer: See the definition of "Proposal (Bid, Bid Proposal)" under Section 1-3 of the Standard Specifications. See the Technical Special Provision for Seminole County Utility Relocations for water sources that can be used for flushing. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/18/2019 2:25:05 PM

---

Question: 24972: Utility sheet U-5 indicates 84' LF of 16" HDPE (POLY) pipe is to be installed via direct bury at app. Sta.191+25 +/- . Will fuse welded HDPE/MJ adaptors only be permitted to be utilized for the installation of the MJ fittings shown to be installed on this 84' of 16" HDPE FM? Or will other connection methods for differing pipe materials be permitted?

---

Answer: Refer to Technical Special Provision for Seminole County Utility Relocations.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/14/2019 9:01:17 AM

---

Question: 24973: Utility specifications state that all materials used in the utility installations (pipe, fittings, etc.) are to be US produced (domestic). Please confirm this is correct, that domestic materials only will be permitted for use on this project.

---

Answer: See Section 6-5 of the Standard Specifications.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/21/2019 4:23:19 PM

---

Question: 24996: Storm Drain Construction; Storm drainage construction is shown to be required in many locations across existing roadways that are not in reconstruction areas/that are in mill and resurface areas. What are the details for these repairs? Please provide details or specify the subgrade, base type and thicknesses, and structural asphalt thickness requirements for these repairs.

---

Answer: See Section 125 of the Standard Specifications.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/15/2019 10:42:18 AM

---

Question: 24997: MOT" The MOT (TCP) plans do not address the installation of the 48" storm drain crossing from S-245 to S-246, across International Parkway. This is also a signalized intersection and is not shown to be reconstructed. Installation of this crossing will also require dewatering. As this crossing was not addressed how is this work intended to be performed? Please provide MOT/TCP plans or details for accomplishing this work so costs can be included accordingly.

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/15/2019 2:39:36 PM

---

---

Question: 24998: MOT" The MOT (TCP) plans do not completely address the installation of the 18" storm drain crossings from S-100 to S-101 and S-245 to S-246, across the SR46 mainline. These are also a signalized intersections and is not shown to be reconstructed. As these crossings were not addressed completely how is this work intended to be performed? Please provide MOT/TCP plans or details for accomplishing this work so costs can be included accordingly.

Posted: 2/27/2019 3:45:28 PM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 2.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/20/2019 9:21:18 AM

---

Question: 25023: The specifications require payment of wages based off Wage Rate FL231 which is associated with Highway Construction. However, FL231 is associated with Buildings in Walton County. Please confirm which wage rate is to be used.

Posted: 3/1/2019 2:38:26 PM

---

Answer: See Supplemental Specifications 1.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/14/2019 9:07:50 AM

---

Question: 25025: Please provide geotechnical data for the proposed pond.

Posted: 3/4/2019 8:13:32 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 2.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/20/2019 9:21:55 AM

---

Question: 25062: The bid quantity of J-8 <10' MHs is 3 EA; however, there are 4 EA listed on the drainage summary and in the plans.

Posted: 3/6/2019 8:34:15 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 1.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/15/2019 2:43:36 PM

---

Question: 25067: Sheet SQ-1 has a note that Pay Item 102-1 includes the cost of commercial materials for driveway maintenance. Sheet SQ-5 provides a quantity for this item. Since this is a certified quantity on the MOT form submitted with each pay application and considering their is an FDOT pay item for this work; how will any overruns be paid for?

Posted: 3/6/2019 1:27:30 PM

Answer:	See Section 9 of the Standard Specifications.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/21/2019 4:27:28 PM
Question:	25070: Referencing the Department's response to Question 24755, the spreadsheet titled "Summary_of_Pavement" contains calculations for the Overbuild. 1. Please confirm how the "Areas from Xsect." were calculated. (What does it represent? Final surface to existing surface? Milled surface to bottom of friction?) 2. Please justify why the cross sectional area was divided by 2 prior (column C) to calculating volume (column D).	Posted:	3/6/2019 2:10:18 PM
Answer:	These overbuild areas were calculated at each station between the milled surface and the bottom of the proposed friction course. The cross sectional areas were divided by 2 as a scale correction since the vertical scale is 2 times the horizontal scale.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/14/2019 12:48:21 PM
Question:	25073: Gopher tortoises have been identified within the project limits and certain burrows are to remain and be protected. 1. If additional active burrows are found, will these tortoises be relocated? And by whom? 2. Was the time required to do a gopher tortoise survey, obtain any relocation permits, and perform relocation considered when establishing contract time?	Posted:	3/6/2019 3:48:23 PM
Answer:	See Special Provision 7-1.4.1 and Standard Specification Section 7-1.4. Also, see response to Question ID 25075 regarding the non-functioning internet link. The time required to perform a survey, obtain relocation permits, and perform relocations for gopher tortoises was considered in establishment of the contract time.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/18/2019 2:26:48 PM
Question:	25074: Plan sheet #148 shows the suggested sequence of construction. In Phase 1A new mast arm structures need to be installed. Mast arms are long lead time items (typically 4-6 months for development of shop drawings, approvals and fabrication). No acquisition period has been established for this contract. Was this considered in the development of the allowable contract time? Would the Department add an acquisition period to this contract and/or increase the contract time to accommodate this long lead time?	Posted:	3/6/2019 3:57:38 PM
Answer:	See Addendum 2 for revised Acquisition Days.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/18/2019 2:27:54 PM
Question:	25075: Specification section 7-1.4.1 refers to a URL address in 2019 Standard Specifications section 7-1.4. This URL address gives an error, "The resource cannot be found." Please provide a working URL address for the referenced information.	Posted:	3/6/2019 3:59:33 PM

Answer:	Use the following new link: <a href="https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/programmanagement/implemented/urlinspecs/files/endangeredwildlifeguidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=e27baf3f_2">https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/programmanagement/implemented/urlinspecs/files/endangeredwildlifeguidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=e27baf3f_2</a>	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/14/2019 10:30:15 AM
Question:	25079: Several locations on the project call out for removal of existing sidewalk in areas that the sidewalk is located outside of the ROW. The cross sections do not appear to show any grading beyond the ROW. Is the Contractor allowed to remove sidewalk in these areas beyond the ROW and, if so, what grading and grassing is required? Is this quantity of grassing included in pay item 570-1-2?	Posted: 3/7/2019 10:25:04 AM
Answer:	Sidewalk removal outside the right-of-way is addressed by signed License Agreements, to be provided after contract award. The quantity for Pay Item 0570-1-2 includes these sidewalk removal areas.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/18/2019 2:29:35 PM
Question:	25092: Sheet U-13 has a 24" MJ Cap on the reclaim line, but no pay item. Please add pay item.	Posted: 3/8/2019 10:35:34 AM
Answer:	See Summary of Pay Items sheets.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/14/2019 12:54:31 PM
Question:	25093: Bid Item 1055-31-508 (8" MJ Cap/Plug) has a bid qty =1, however there are at least (5) 8" MJ Cap/Plug shown (U-6,9,11,12,14). Please revise Bid Qty to reflect work required on plans.	Posted: 3/8/2019 10:48:36 AM
Answer:	See Pay Item 1080-29-108.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/18/2019 2:30:40 PM
Question:	25094: Sheet U-12 shows a 8" MJ Cap on PE pipe. Will an insert stiffener and MJ gland be allowed, or will a MJ Adapter be required? Please specify requirement.	Posted: 3/8/2019 10:52:39 AM
Answer:	Refer to Technical Special Provision for Seminole County Utility Relocations.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/14/2019 1:03:28 PM
Question:	25095: Sheet U-12 has (2) 8" Valves creating a take off qty = 8; Bid Qty = 7. Please revise Bid Qty.	Posted: 3/8/2019 11:49:27 AM



---

Answer: The bid quantity for this item has been verified and will not be revised. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/14/2019 1:09:31 PM

---

Question: 25097: Bid Item 1080-26-108 (8" ARV) shows a qty = 1 under U-10 on sheet U-3A, however there does not appear to be any 8" ARV's on U-10. Please confirm, revise bid qty as required. Posted: 3/8/2019 1:25:09 PM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 2. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/20/2019 9:19:52 AM

---

Question: 25099: Summary of Pay Items Sheet # U-3A shows a 4" Line Stop on U-5, however there does not appear to be a 4" Line Stop on sheet U-5. Please confirm, revise bid qty as required. Posted: 3/8/2019 2:33:47 PM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 2. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/20/2019 9:20:20 AM

---

Question: 25100: Summary of Pay item Sheet U-3A shows a 4" plug valve under U-9, however a 4" plug valve was not found on U-9 (only a 4" tapping valve). Please confirm, revise bid qty as required. Posted: 3/8/2019 2:36:20 PM

---

Answer: There is a 4" plug valve (PV) on Sheet U-9 at the 16"x4" tee. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/14/2019 1:15:16 PM

---

Question: 25102: Summary of Pay Items Sheet U-3A shows (2) 8" Plug Valves under U-11. Sheet U-11 itself shows (1) 8" Tapping Valve and a symbol for (1) 8" valve without a call out. Please clarify and revise bid qty as required. Posted: 3/8/2019 2:45:15 PM

---

Answer: There are two 8" plug valves (PV) labeled on Sheet U-11. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED  
Posted: 3/18/2019 2:31:48 PM

---

Question: 25103: Pay Item 1080-29-108 shows a qty = 24 on U-3A, including a qty's of 10 and 9 on sheets U-11 and U-12, respectively. These qtys were not found. Please confirm and revise bid qty as required. Posted: 3/8/2019 2:58:44 PM

Answer:	See Section T01270 of the Technical Special Provisions for Seminole County Utility Relocations. The bid quantity for Pay Item 1080-29-108 will not be revised.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/18/2019 2:32:48 PM
Question:	25109: The utility adjustments show an existing Seminole County BFOT and an Unknown BT that appear to conflict with the proposed storm drainage among other things in certain areas along the south side of SR 46. The utility work schedules do not appear to address these utilities. For instance, S-107 shows an existing 3" BT Vvh CTH11 (sheet 52) in conflict with the structure. Please advise.	Posted: 3/11/2019 10:48:00 AM
Answer:	See the ITS Plans for the Seminole County BFOT. The "Unknown BT" shown on the Utility Adjustments sheets is out of service and shall be removed in areas of conflict. See Plan Revision 2 for added pay item and quantity.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/22/2019 3:15:42 PM
Question:	25110: Bid Item 1050 16004: Utility pipe removal 8"-19.9": We cannot verify the bid qty. Beginning at sheet U-5, this sheet indicates 166 LF of pipe removal. Take off quantity on this sheet is a minimum of 400 LF. Please review and revise bid qty.	Posted: 3/11/2019 10:49:53 AM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 2.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/22/2019 3:16:13 PM
Question:	25111: Bid Item 1050 16005: Utility Pipe Removal 20-49.9": Summary of pay item sheet has 562 LF under U-13. Take off qty on U-13 = 20 LF. Please review and revise bid qty.	Posted: 3/11/2019 10:54:03 AM
Answer:	The bid quantity for Pay Item 1050-16-005 will not be revised.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/18/2019 2:34:35 PM
Question:	25112: Bid Item 1050 18004: Utility Pipe Plug 8-19.9": Qty sheet U-3 shows 188 LF under U-14. Take off for U-14 is 94 LF (12" FM). Please review and revise qty.	Posted: 3/11/2019 10:56:54 AM
Answer:	The bid quantity for Pay Item 1050-18-004 will not be revised.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 3/20/2019 8:33:07 AM

Question:	25113: Bid Item 1050 42206: 6" HDPE: Bid qty = 326 LF, however this includes 158 LF on U-9 that is 10" HDPE. Please review and revise bid qty.	Posted:	3/11/2019 11:08:39 AM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 1.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/15/2019 2:49:23 PM
Question:	25114: Bid item 1050 42210: 10" HDPE Pipe: Bid Qty = 160 LF, however there is an additional 193 LF 10" HDPE on U-14. The other 10" HDPE is 148 LF on U-9. Please review and revise qty.	Posted:	3/11/2019 11:12:17 AM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 1.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/15/2019 2:49:50 PM
Question:	25115: Bid Item 1080 23102: 2" Saddle: Bid qty = 18, however this is one half of the qty of saddles required for temporary jumper connections. Please review and revise qty.	Posted:	3/11/2019 11:17:04 AM
Answer:	See Section T01270 of the Technical Special Provision for Seminole County Utility Relocations. The bid quantity for Pay Item 1080-23-102 will not be revised.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/20/2019 8:34:22 AM
Question:	25117: The traffic control plans depict temporary pavement in Phase I and Phase II. The bulk of temporary pavement shown in Phase III is the same as the temporary in Phase II based on overlaying the 2 phases. The only difference is the temporary pavement for pedestrians in Phase III. The summary of quantities shows Special Detour 1 associated with Phase I and Special Detour 2 associated with Phase III. However, there is no Special Detour associated with Phase II; please advise.	Posted:	3/11/2019 1:42:25 PM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 1 and work zone limits for Phase II of the Temporary Traffic Control Plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/18/2019 3:27:21 PM
Question:	25120: The summary of Pay Items on sheet U-3 shows a quantity of 20 lf of 2" HDPE on sheet U-6 but is not shown on the plan sheet U-6 or any other sheets. Please provide location and/or adjust pay item summary.	Posted:	3/11/2019 2:38:19 PM

Answer:	See label on Sheet U-6 for 2" PE (Sta. 196+15.50, 92.00' R).	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/19/2019 2:09:33 PM
Question:	25121: On sheet U-3, it appears the quantity for 6" and 10" HDPE water/sewer are incorrect. Please review and make adjustments to the Quantity Summary.	Posted:	3/11/2019 2:48:27 PM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 1.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/18/2019 2:54:12 PM
Question:	25128: 0120-1 Regular excavation - The quantity appears to be low when compared to Roadway and Pond Excavation takeoff quantities. Please confirm correct quantity and revise Bid Qnty.	Posted:	3/12/2019 9:47:28 AM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 2.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/20/2019 9:23:57 AM
Question:	25179: What impact will the adjacent projects have on this project? Specifically, MOT and Utility adjustments.	Posted:	3/14/2019 10:13:03 AM
Answer:	See Section 8 of the Standard Specifications.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/21/2019 4:30:48 PM
Question:	25200: On Typical Section Sheet 10-1 issued in Addenda 2; the right typical section station call outs appear to be wrong. The first range (Sta. 192+50.00 To Sta. 198+00.00) is also on sheet 10; while the second range needs corrected. Should it be Sta. 225+25.00 to Sta. 259+50.00 not Sta. 214+65.20? Please review and provide corrected Typical Section Sheets.	Posted:	3/15/2019 11:06:53 AM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 2.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:05:18 PM
Question:	25203: Similar to question 24752; Phase 3 of the Traffic Control Plan does not provide enough proposed pavement width to accommodate Phase 4 inside turn lanes and low-profile barrier wall for SR46 WB. Overlaying the phases show a gap of approximately 11 ft. Please advise.	Posted:	3/15/2019 2:56:20 PM

Answer:	See Plan Revision 2.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:06:03 PM
Question:	25204: The Traffic Control Plan cross-sections for Phase 1 and Phase 3 have channelizing Devices, in the median, beyond the proposed temporary asphalt; either on a slope or floating. What is the intention? Is the temporary asphalt width correct? (see sheet 172, and 211 for examples)	Posted:	3/15/2019 3:25:45 PM
Answer:	The temporary pavement width is correct.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:08:32 PM
Question:	25205: Addenda #2 increased the acquisition period to 120 days but the mast arms cannot be procured until after the installation of the drilled shaft foundations and the completion of their as-built drawings. Since the acquisition period occurs before Notice to Proceed (NTP) and the drill shafts have to be installed after NTP; Would the Department increase the contract time by 120 days?	Posted:	3/15/2019 4:05:27 PM
Answer:	No.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:09:05 PM
Question:	25206: Referring to the Department's response to Question 24751: The revised TCP make no references to the utilization of "temporary asphalt overbuild," thus the Contractor is to provide "temporary pavement" per Section 102 and Basis of Estimates. The revised TCP does not address the phasing and sequencing for construction of temporary pavement where it conflicts the existing travel lanes (Phase I - STA 201+02.30 to STA 218+00). Essentially up to 19' of "temporary base and asphalt" is to be construction in existing travel lanes? What is the Department intentions? The condition depicted in the plans and cross-sections is not clearly shown in the TCP Typical Sections. Please provide clarification.	Posted:	3/15/2019 4:09:56 PM
Answer:	See Section 102 of the Standard Specifications.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:12:46 PM
Question:	25207: The TTCP does not show proposed milling and overbuild in the phasing and sequencing. Please advise.	Posted:	3/15/2019 4:10:40 PM

---

Answer: See Section 102 of the Standard Specifications. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/22/2019 3:13:32 PM

---

Question: 25223: Pond 6; There are no cross sections including soils reports and water tables provided for the proposed Pond 6. This information must be provided to determine the suitability of the excavated soils for use on the project or to determine if they are unsuitable and will require disposal. Please provide this critical information so this work can be reviewed and priced accurately. Posted: 3/19/2019 7:39:31 AM

---

Answer: See Plan Revision 2. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/22/2019 3:19:54 PM

---

Question: 25235: Plan notes and Summary of Quantity sheets do not clearly specify what work or items are to be included in the Special Detour 1 and Special Detour 2 bid items and several bid questions have addressed the clarity of the required scope of work for these items without response. Please clearly specify or identify what work and costs are to be included in these bid items (Special Detour 1 and Special Detour 2) so costs for work required in these items can be included accordingly. Posted: 3/19/2019 4:28:46 PM

---

Answer: See Section 102 of the Standard Specifications. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/22/2019 3:23:08 PM

---

Question: 25260: Addendum 2 included details for asphalt CURB pads indicating concrete curb within the asphalt base limits are to have asphalt curb pads. Is this applicable to the concrete traffic separators also? Will the concrete traffic separators within the asphalt base limits be required to have asphalt pads also or are they to be constructed on the stabilized subgrade only? Please clarify this issue so costs can be included accordingly if required. Posted: 3/20/2019 1:40:04 PM

---

Answer: See Standard Plans Index 520-020 regarding concrete traffic separators. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 3/22/2019 3:28:23 PM

---

Question: 25261: New Item 1080-2-60; Addendum 3 added new bid item 1080-2-60, Utility Fiber Optic, Telephone Communications, Remove & Dispose, Contractor Takes Ownership. Will a new Technical Specification be provided or issued for this item? What is specifically to be included in this new bid item? Please define or clarify the scope of work and costs to be included in this new bid item. Posted: 3/20/2019 1:43:59 PM

Answer:	See response to Question ID 25109.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:31:35 PM
Question:	25262: The answer to question 25128 does not address the quantity issue. Pond excavation quantities are low. The plan Quantity for Pond Excavation has 4243Cy regular ex and 80,747Cy subsoil ex; Take off quantities are showing that there is 49,962Cy regular ex and 93,016Cy subsoil ex. in the pond. Please verify these quantities and make the needed adjustments. This is critical to an accurate bid.	Posted:	3/20/2019 1:58:41 PM
Answer:	See Plan Revision 3.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/9/2019 3:32:52 PM
Answer:	Total earthwork quantities will be revised in an upcoming plan revision, as follows: Regular Excavation = 27,991.5 CY; Subsoil Excavation = 125,942.5 CY; Embankment = 31,294 CY.	Status:	ANSWER VOIDED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 4:46:52 PM
Question:	25276: There is no bid item 0102-14, Traffic Control Officer for this project though there is significant work within signalized intersections that will require lane closures through the intersections such as major drainage installation work and including modification of existing signals and installation of new signals over traffic. Will a bid item and quantity for this work be provided or will ALL use of Off duty Law Enforcement Officers/Traffic Control Officers be incidental and included in other items? Please clarify this issue or provide a bid items and quantity for this work accordingly.	Posted:	3/21/2019 2:41:48 PM
Answer:	See Section 102 of the Standard Specifications.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/22/2019 3:36:16 PM
Question:	25277: Due to the revised earthwork quantities and new plans provided in Addenda #3 the job has changed considerably, can the bid date be extended?	Posted:	3/21/2019 3:16:18 PM
Answer:	The Bid Letting Date has been moved.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/28/2019 9:15:02 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:	3/25/2019 3:25:04 AM

Question:	25280: Due to the recent changes made in Addenda 3; would the FDOT consider extending the bid time?	Posted:	3/22/2019 9:59:26 AM
Answer:	The Bid Letting Date has been moved.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	3/28/2019 9:16:50 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:	3/25/2019 3:25:04 AM
Question:	25290: Phase 1 temporary asphalt cross sections indicate waters shed to the north, Phase 2 asphalt cross sections indicate water shed to the south. Is the intent of detour # 2 the reconstruction of the previously placed temporary Detour # 1 asphalt.	Posted:	3/22/2019 3:51:29 PM
Answer:	Any potential reuse of temporary pavement from a previous Temporary Traffic Control phase shall be determined by the Contractor for conformance with the Contract Documents.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/17/2019 4:10:22 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 VOIDED
		Posted:	3/25/2019 3:25:04 AM
Question:	25501: We have been in contact with several suppliers regarding mast arms procurement. Due to the current demand from current projects in Florida, and the resulting availability of materials for fabrication, the lead time for mast arms is currently 20+ weeks after approval of all shop drawings by the Department. This above normal lead time affects the project critical path due to the MOT plans using the Mast arms for temporary signalization. Will the Department adjust the contract time to accommodate these present procurement conditions?	Posted:	4/10/2019 9:03:08 AM
Answer:	The advertised Contract Days will not be revised.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	4/17/2019 1:03:39 PM
Question:	25502: With a delay anticipated in the procurement of Mast Arms and the need for them during early MOT Phases; Will the department look at adding additional temp Signalization pay items to the contract? (poles, heads, etc.)	Posted:	4/10/2019 9:11:33 AM



---

Answer: No additional pay items will be added at this time.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 4/17/2019 1:04:26 PM