Bid Questions and Answers Report Date & Time: 6/12/2019 9:13:59 AM

District Address: District 7 Construction Office, located at 11201 N McKinley, Tampa, FL 33612

District Phone: (813) 975-6285

Proposal: T7433

Project: 256323-1-52-01

Letting Date: 6/12/2019

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 52

Question:	25694: Please provide the computations of all project quantities. This project does not include SQ pages.	Posted:	4/18/2019 2:05:46 PM
Answer:	The SQ sheets are include in the plan set at the end of the Roadway Plan set. Please see Index.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/2/2019 2:15:15 PM
Question:	25695: The temporary traffic control plans show temporary wall on page 621 of the plans but no quantities have been provided. Please provide a pay item for retaining wall systems, temporary.	Posted:	4/18/2019 2:14:48 PM
Answer:	This is part of the Special Detour. Per the Basis of Estimate: SPECIAL DETOURS: A Special Detour is a diversion or lane shift that requires temporary pavement. Payment for the work of constructing, maintaining, and subsequently removing the special detour (earthwork, base, asphalt, Acrow Bridge, etc.) will be paid for as a special detour. DO NOT INCLUDE traffic control devices, warning devices, barriers, temporary sod, signing, and pavement markings for special detours; they will be paid under their respective items. Temporary drainage will be included under the Special Detour. Removal of the Special detour (earthwork, base, asphalt, acrow bridge, etc.) is INCLUDED in the Lump Sum payment.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/16/2019 10:14:28 AM
Question:	25696: Can the geotechnical report be made available for the contractors to review?	Posted:	4/18/2019 2:42:30 PM
Answer:	Attached please find the geotechnical report. question 25696- 256323_1_FINAL_Roadway_Soil_Survey_Report_2018_12_13	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/2/2019 11:52:49 AM

Document:	8598016: question 25696-256323_1_FINAL_Roadway_Soil_Survey_Report_2018_12_13.pdf question 25696-256323_1_FINAL_Roadway_Soil_Survey_Report_2018_12_13

Question:	25788: The CADD files do not include the geopak (.gpk) or xml (.xml) files, will the Department provide these missing CADD files?	Posted:	4/29/2019 1:55:42 PM
Answer:	The .gpk files are not required to be submitted but will be provided.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/16/2019 10:10:53 AM

Document:	8655522: job052.gpk job052

Answer:	Attached please find the gpk files.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER VOIDED 5/16/2019 10:07:04 AM

Document:	8655412: job052.gpk job052

Question:	25851: There appears to be a discrepancy between the plan quantity and bid tab quantity for Item 1530 5-7.9" pipe removal. The utility summary shows 90 LF but the bid tab has 14,080 LF. Please clarify.	Posted:	5/2/2019 11:00:16 AM
Answer:	There is no Pay Item 1530 on this project. For Pay Item 1050-16-003 - Utility Pipe, Remove & Dispose, 5-7.9":/ Project 256323-1-56-01 has a Quantity of [illegible] . 90 LF/ Project 256323-1-52-02 has a Quantity of [illegible] . 13990 LF/ Total of both Projects [illegible] . 14080 LF/ See the Summary of Pay Items Sheet 15. The 56-01 is for the Pasco County UWHCA component set. The 52-02 is separate funding for Clearwater Gas UWHCA. The removals are shown in the Utility Adjustment Sheets and listed in the UWS. There is not a separate component set.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/16/2019 10:09:02 AM

Question:	25891: Structure EX-20, type D partial, is shown in drainage structure cross sections but is not included in summary of drainage on pages 35 to 44. There is no pay item for type D partial in the summary of pay items, could a pay item be added?	Posted:	5/6/2019 11:21:41 AM

Answer:	Added Pay Item 0425-1-545 thru a plan revison - INLETS, DITCH BOTTOM, TYPE D, PARTIAL- quantity of 1	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/21/2019 7:49:05 PM

Question:	26040: I would like to request all microstation quantities shape dgn files that were not included in our cadd files in order to compare quantities using geopak.	Posted:	5/14/2019 3:37:20 PM

Answer:	Files are provided with this response. These files are for information only. The shapes only represent two dimensions and a thickness needs to be applied to some of them to determine the correct volume.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/22/2019 11:57:02 AM

Document:	8679822: qtdsrd01_Rev01.dgn qtdsrd01_Rev01.dgn

Document:	8679826: QTDSRD02.DGN QTDSRD02.DGN

Document:	8679828: qtdsrd03.dgn qtdsrd03.dgn

Question:	26057: The Roadway pay items include 16,079 SF of "Retaining Wall System, Permanent, Excluding Barrier", however there appears to be no permanent retaining wall details included with the Structures plans (only temporary critical sheet pile wall details). Please advise if this is an error in the bid items or provide the permanent retaining wall details.	Posted:	5/15/2019 9:44:25 AM

Answer:	Retaining Walls are shown in the Roadway Plans - Miscellaneous Structures Sheets - Sheets 730-741	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/21/2019 7:47:54 PM

Question:	26147: Pay Item 0145-2: Geosynthetic Reinforced Foundation Over Soft Soil. On Plan Sheet 623, they call for geotextile listed on the APL for Type R-2 with a T-allowable strength of 2,435 LB/FT. There are only 3 geotextiles listed on the APL for Type R-2 and none of them meet that strength requirement. Will a uniaxial geogrid be acceptable as an alternative to a geotextile?	Posted:	5/22/2019 1:33:31 PM

Answer:	A uniaxial geogrid is an acceptable alternative provided it meets the minimum TA strength of 2,435 LB/FT.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/24/2019 10:36:34 AM
Question:	26148: On Sheet 740 the Table for Wall 1 the elevations for both the top of wall and proposed ground elevation seems to have some inconsistent elevations. Please revise.	Posted:	5/22/2019 1:48:45 PM
Answer:	The values for the last 3 rows in the table should read (437+00.00, 93.500 LT, 65.686, 62.38), (437+50.00, 93.500 LT, 65.311, 62.19), & (437+65.00, 93.500 LT, 65.199, 65.20)	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/28/2019 10:27:13 AM
Question:	26154: I have not been abele to find connection details between MSE Walls and Box Culvert Wingwalls. Are the MSE wall panels to lap behind Box Culvert Wing Walls or butt up to end of wingwalls?? Please provide a connection detail between MSE wall and Box Culvert Wingwalls.	Posted:	5/23/2019 10:13:47 AM
Answer:	The MSE wall should butt up against the end of the culvert wingwall with the face of the MSE wall set back 6" from the face of the wingwall. The exact detail should be shown in the manufacturer's shop drawings per Section 548-4.4. As a minimum, they should follow the joint requirements in Section 548-2.5.2.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/28/2019 10:35:11 AM
Question:	26155: Regarding Traffic Control Plan Sheet (8) Phase 1 it appears that CD-1401 will require a skewed construction joint. Per Standard Specification 400-7.14 Transverse construction Joints if necessary are to be made at right angles to the culvert barrel. How are we to provide a Right angle construction joint and leave enough room for MOT??? Please provide a detail of how this construction joint is to be constructed.	Posted:	5/23/2019 10:30:17 AM
Answer:	The barrels of the box culvert can be staggered. This will allow each barrel to have a right angle construction joint. This will leave enough room for the MOT.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/28/2019 10:38:26 AM
Question:	26156: Regarding General Note 8. on Plan sheet 52. All paving activities should be non-vibratory due to the area being prone to sinkholes and subsurface subsidence. Has the department no concern regarding Vibration and other construction activities I.E. Sheet Pile Installation and or Roadway Compaction??	Posted:	5/23/2019 10:49:36 AM
Answer:	Paving activities should be completed with non-vibratory equipment. Vibratory equipment is acceptable for earthwork activities and sheet pile installation/extraction subject to FDOT Specification Section 108 Monitoring of Existing Structures regarding protection of existing structures. (The appropriate pay items will be included in the upcoming addendum).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/28/2019 11:00:35 AM

Question:	26157: Temporary Critical Wall at Sta.1601 show the alignment and limits to be in-conflict with proposed Bridge Culvert. What was the intent of showing the sheet pile under the proposed Culvert?? Muck Delineation Plan Sheet 5 of 6 show organic material as Not Encountered thru the limits of the existing culvert to be removed.	Posted:	5/23/2019 11:14:24 AM
Answer:	The intent of showing the sheet pile is to prevent differential settlement during muck removal. Please also refer to the roadway cross sections which include the limits of the unsuitable material.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/7/2019 6:08:39 PM
Answer:	The intent of showing the sheet pile is to prevent differential settlement during muck removal.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER VOIDED 5/29/2019 11:02:15 AM
Answer:	The intent of showing the sheet pile is to prevent differential settlement during muck removal. Please also refer to the roadway cross sections which include the limits of the unsuitable.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER VOIDED 6/7/2019 6:06:54 PM
Question:	26158: All of the Temporary critical walls shown at the Box Culverts between phases have Sheet pile drawn across the top of the Box Culverts. Cantilever data provided would not apply in this area. How are we to retain fill above the Box Culverts thru the limits of the Box Culverts??	Posted:	5/23/2019 11:25:24 AM
Answer:	The depth of fill over the culverts is shallow (1'-3') and can be sloped at 1:2.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:31:49 PM
Question:	26163: According to the Box Culvert Data Tables for all Culverts Note 6. Settlement Criteria For Precast Box Culvert Option the Long Term Differential Settlement is anticipated at .04' or 1/2". According to Standard Index 400-291 Culverts will require a Cast In Place Link Slab to ensure uniform joint opening of Precast Box Culverts. Are we to include the cost of Cast in Place Link Slabs with Pay Item 400-4-1 Concrete Class IV, Culverts??	Posted:	5/23/2019 11:59:15 AM
Answer:	The link slabs are not required because the differential settlement is below the limit.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:33:11 PM

Question:	26171: Roadway Plan Sheet 58 calls for the 24" storm pipe crossing between S-210 and S-211 to be jack & bored under the existing roadway but the Temporary Traffic Control Plan Sheet 631 instructs us to construct this pipe using lane closure during off peak hours, seemingly indicating it will be installed via open cut. What is the DOT's intent with respect to the installation method of this storm crossing jack and bore or open cut? Or is it the contractors discretion?	Posted:	5/23/2019 4:46:25 PM
Answer:	The only two jack and bores are at Sta. 390+45.95 and Sta. 396+13.37, to go under the FGT gas line. The other references to jack and bore will be removed, and the pay item numbers for jack and bore (24" and 48") will be included in the upcoming revision.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:36:16 PM
Question:	26173: Please provide AGI Lighting File to allow other Approved APL Lighting Manufacturers to provide layout	Posted:	5/24/2019 6:18:53 AM
Answer:	The AGI Lighting file is provided with this response. This file is for information only.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 11:15:28 AM

Document: 8707521: 25632315201-AGI_File.zip

256323-1-52-01 SR 52 AGI Lighting File

Question:	26182: Does the HDPE need to be upsized to 24" or is 20" the correct size on HDPE connecting to 20". Usually it is upsized due to the ID of the HDPE being smaller than same size PVC.	Posted:	5/24/2019 11:47:56 AM
Answer:	No, the HDPE does not need to be upsized to 24". 20" is the correct size.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/29/2019 3:52:20 PM
Question:	26183: There does not appear to be elevation (top or invert) provided for structure B-2a in the Drainage Structures Sheets. Can this information please be provided?	Posted:	5/24/2019 3:09:22 PM
Answer:	Elevations for Structure B-2a are provided on the Single Box Drainage Details Sheet (Sheet 288).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/29/2019 4:07:32 PM

Question:	26190: Regarding the Wildlife Crossing at Sta. 447+20 plans specify to Fill Culvert Bottom with 2' of A-3 Sand Aggregate EL. 52.00. Are we to include the cost of this in Pay Item 0400-4-1 Concrete Class IV, Culverts???	Posted:	5/25/2019 9:56:45 AM
Answer:	A-3 Sand Aggregate is to be included in the cost of the culvert. A pay item footnote will be provided for clarification in the upcoming revision.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/29/2019 4:09:45 PM
Question:	26191: CD-1301 Plan Sheet B1-1 call for a Precast Concrete Weir. Could you please clarify what end of the culvert this is to be installed and if a Cast in Place will be acceptable??	Posted:	5/25/2019 10:00:11 AM
Answer:	The weirs are to be installed at both ends of the culvert. Cast in place would be acceptable.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:37:41 PM
Question:	26193: We cannot find structure data (type, elevations) for storm structures S-C1 & S-C1a (located at approx. sta. 437+60 Rt.) on the Roadway Plans, Summary of Drainage Structures sheets, Pond Detail sheets nor the Drainage Structures sheets. Can you please direct us as to where the structure information can be found or provide this missing information?	Posted:	5/28/2019 10:08:15 AM
Answer:	Structure data for storm structures S-C1 and S-C1a are provided on the Single Box Drainage Details Sheet (Sheet 288).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/29/2019 4:12:52 PM
Question:	26195: On Single Box Drainage Details Sheet 288, structure S-311a is designated as a manhole with 199 LF of 30" pipe assigned to it. However, Drainage Structures Sheet 237 is calling S-311a a shoulder gutter inlet Type S (top only) attached to box culvert CD-1101 only, which is consistent with how it is depicted on Roadway Plans (11), Sheet 63. Can you please clarify this apparent discrepancy?	Posted:	5/28/2019 12:40:55 PM
Answer:	Structure S-311a is shown correctly on Drainage Structures sheet 237. The Single Box Drainage Details sheet 288 is incorrect and should be labeled as S-311d instead of S-311a with details as shown on the Drainage Structures sheet 238 for S-311d. Sheet 288 will be revised and included in the upcoming revision.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/29/2019 4:35:54 PM
Question:	26203: On Roadway Plans (20) Sheet 72, at the lower right corner of the sheet near storm structure S-D210 there is a call out for 165' of 18" pipe but there is no new storm pipe drawn where the arrow points to. Is this call out in error, is the pipe not drawn in at this location or should this call out be located somewhere else?	Posted:	5/29/2019 10:01:10 AM

Answer:	This call out will be removed.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:39:42 PM
Question:	26204: Roadway Plans (20) Sheet 72 calls for the 18" storm pipe crossing between S-421 and S-425 to be jack & bored under the existing roadway but the existing roadway is to the south of this work and the 24" storm pipe between S-425 and S-426 is what crosses under the existing roadway. Should the note about the jack and bore pertain to the pipe run between S-425 & S-426? In addition, Temporary Traffic Control Plan (6) Sheet 635 instructs us to construct this pipe crossing using lane closure during off peak hours, seemingly indicating it will be installed via open cut. What is the DOT's intent with respect to the installation method of this storm crossing jack and bore or open cut? Or is it the contractors discretion?	Posted:	5/29/2019 10:15:04 AM
Answer:	The only two jack and bores are at Sta. 390+45.95 and Sta. 396+13.37, to go under the FGT gas line. The other references to jack and bore will be removed, and the pay item numbers for jack and bore (24" and 48") will be included in the upcoming revision.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:46:36 PM
Question:	26205: In the table provided on Sheet 288, Single Box Drainage Details, for Control Structure S-D230 it calls for a grate elevation of 73.37 and an outlet FL elevation of 72.70, or 8" between the top of the structure and the outlet pipe flow invert elevation. The outlet pipe is designated as a 24"x 38" pipe so the structure wont work as provided. Can the correct elevation data be provided for this structure?	Posted:	5/29/2019 11:08:48 AM
Answer:	Structure S-D230 has been modified to a MES. It has been eliminated from Sheet 288.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 4:28:37 PM
Question:	26217: There are several endwalls on the project (for example S-400d & S-400e) that show on the Drainage Structures Plans and Roadway plans as straight endwalls but are called out as U-Type Endwalls on the Summary of Drainage Structures Sheets and seem to be accounted for as such in the pay item quantities for U-Endwalls. Can you please clarify what type of endwalls are required?	Posted:	5/29/2019 5:27:42 PM
Answer:	Pay items and quantities will be corrected to endwalls from U-endwalls in the upcoming revision.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/30/2019 1:49:46 PM
Question:	26224: On Shady Hills it doesn't show a temporary signal however I know it does get temporary detection for the construction but when you get to page 681 they seem to have a temporary signal somewhat drawn in on that page. Was this an accident or does Shady Hills get a temporary signal also.	Posted:	5/31/2019 8:32:16 AM

Answer:	On Sheet 681 (Phase II Shady Hills) the intent is to use the permanent signal pole locations and place signal heads along the span wire to meet the temporary lane configurations for this phase / intersection.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/3/2019 3:29:27 PM
Question:	26228: For the utility relocation work, there is only one 20" line stop being utilized to isolate the existing main for tie-in purposes, this being the offset of the water main between sta. 441+10 to 448+90 Rt. Should we assume that for all other instances of the utility offsets/tie-ins designated on the plans, we will be able to isolate the existing mains utilizing existing valves or do we need to include additional line stops as incidental to the cost of the work in provided pay items?	Posted:	5/31/2019 11:53:50 AM
Answer:	The intent of the utility design is that the existing line valves will be utilized by the County to isolate specific piping sections in order for the Contractor to accomplish the proposed piping connections. The estimated volume of water within each isolated piping section is provided in the utility plans for the Contractor's information. The Contractor is responsible for the removal and disposal of the water from the piping sections during each connection, with the payment for this activity included in the provided pay items. If the contractor wishes to utilize alternate means or methods to accomplish the water removal and disposal, including reducing the volume of water (i.e. line stops), these costs shall be included in the provided pay items.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/3/2019 3:41:54 PM
Question:	26232: Can the Department provide an asphalt core report to determine the depth of the existing asphalt?	Posted:	5/31/2019 1:50:30 PM
Answer:	Since the project is nearly all reconstruction, the Department did not core the project. Pavement design west of and under the Suncoast Parkway was based on as-built plans.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/3/2019 3:43:32 PM
Question:	26234: The storm pipe run from S-714 to S-717 is called out as 24" pipe on Roadway Plans (28) Sheet 80 but is depicted as 18" pipe on Pond Details Pond G Sheet 311. What size pipe is required for this pipe run?	Posted:	5/31/2019 3:41:22 PM
Answer:	Roadway plan sheet is correct - 24".	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:14:59 PM
Question:	26235: The storm pipe run from S-703 to 705 is called out as 24" pipe on Roadway Plans (28) Sheet 80 but is depicted as 19"x30" pipe on Pond Details Pond G Sheet 311. What size pipe is required for this pipe run?	Posted:	5/31/2019 3:43:34 PM

Answer:	Roadway plan sheet is correct - 24".	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:15:40 PM
Question:	26236: The storm structure S-801 is called out as a 7 ft diameter j-bottom on Drainage Structures Sheet 270 but is called out as a 6 ft x 6 ft j-bottom on Pond Details Pond H Sheet 312. What is the correct bottom size for this structure? If it is a 7 ft diameter structure bottom are both S-801A & S-801B to be the same as well?	Posted:	5/31/2019 3:59:43 PM
Answer:	S-801 is a round structure (Roadway and Drainage Structure Sheets are correct), S-801A & S-801B are square.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:17:29 PM
Question:	26238: The side drain crossing the driveway at sta. 1581 Lt. on Roadway Plans (34) Sheet 86 does not have a size or length call out on the sheet. Can you please provide the pipe size and length of the side drain?	Posted:	5/31/2019 4:24:29 PM
Answer:	Pipe size is 18" and length is 46 LF. Quantity needs to be added along with 2 - 18" MES.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:19:17 PM
Question:	26245: There is no call out provided for the side drain at sta. 581 Lt. on Roadway Plans (34) Sheet 86. Can the pipe size and length for this side drain driveway crossing be provided?	Posted:	6/3/2019 10:25:01 AM
Answer:	Pipe size is 18" and length is 46 LF. Quantity needs to be added along with 2 - 18" MES.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:23:09 PM
Question:	26246: There is conflicting information for storm structure S-652 between Roadway Plans (37) Sheet 89, Drainage Structures Sheet 285 and Drainage Details Sheet 288. The outlet flow elevation on Sheet 288 is a 71.70 but it is called out as 70.20, a one and a half foot difference. Further, on the Roadway Plans the outlet pipe is called out as 30" pipe (and therefore a 30" MES for S-652a) but in the chart on the Drainage Details page, this pipe and MES are called out as 24" pipe. Can you please provide the correct outlet FL elevation for S-652 along with the correct outlet pipe and mitered end (S-652a) size?	Posted:	6/3/2019 10:37:11 AM
Answer:	S-652 and S-652a are correct as shown on the Plan Sheet (30") and Drainage Structure Sheet (FL 70.20).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:25:42 PM

Question:	26254: Plan sheet 742 shows approximately 30,843 SF of Permanent Sheet Pile Wall to be installed on the project. Please explain which pay item covers this work.	Posted:	6/3/2019 3:35:33 PM
Answer:	Pay Item 455-133-3 - Sheet Piling Steel, F&I Permanent. See SQ-46.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:26:44 PM
Question:	26263: Roadway Plans (11 & 12) Sheets 63 & 64 have callouts for 30" SD (out of S-C210, C230 and 311d) as well as 36" SD (out of S-C231), however there are no pay items for 30" or 36" SD. Can these pay items be added to the bid or should the cost for this pipe be included in pay items 0430-175-130 and 0430-175-136 respectively?	Posted:	6/4/2019 10:23:07 AM
Answer:	These should be called out as PIPE. They are quantified in Pay Items 0430-175-130 and 0430-175-136.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/6/2019 3:49:01 PM
Question:	26264: On sheet 742 of the plans there is permanent sheet pile detailed for muck removal. There is no pay item for the permanent sheet pile, how is the contractor to be paid for these permanent sheets?	Posted:	6/4/2019 11:32:27 AM
Answer:	Pay Item 455-133-3 - Sheet Piling Steel, F&I Permanent. See SQ-46.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:27:52 PM
Question:	26274: The conduit quantities on the signalization plans, for Trench and Bore, do not match the Tabulation of Quantities (TOQ's); for example I have tabulated a quantity of 927lf for Pay Item 630-2-11 on plan sheet T-9, 309lf less than the TOQ's (1236lf) on plan sheet T-3 for plan sheet T-9.	Posted:	6/4/2019 4:17:21 PM
Answer:	Bid the pay items based on the quantity provided in the Proposal Summary of Pay Items on the Summary of Pay Items sheet 12. Final quantities will be determined per Standard Specification 630-5 (Basis of Payment for Conduit).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/7/2019 11:42:12 AM
Question:	26275: Storm structure S-EN is designated as a Type E Ditch Bottom Inlet Control Structure on Drainage Details Sheet 288 but their is no pay item for Type E structures. Where are we to include the cost of this structure?	Posted:	6/4/2019 4:31:24 PM

Answer:	This should be a Type D Structure. No pay item needs to be added.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/6/2019 4:14:40 PM
Question:	26276: Can the Department have the EOR verify the Signalization Qty's for Trench & Bore; Pay Items 630-2-11 and 630-2-12; I cannot verify the 1485lf of Trenched Conduit on plan sheet T-11. Additionally; I cannot verify the 326lf of Directional Bore of plan sheet T-7.	Posted:	6/4/2019 4:48:27 PM
Answer:	Bid the pay items based on the quantity provided in the Proposal Summary of Pay Items on the Summary of Pay Items sheet 12. Final quantities will be determined per Standard Specification 630-5 (Basis of Payment for Conduit).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/7/2019 11:42:56 AM
Question:	26286: For pay items 711-14-560 and 711-14-570 are they going to need to be border or block contrast? There is a huge price difference between the two so if you could clear that up it would be most helpful.	Posted:	6/5/2019 10:16:30 AM
Answer:	Per sheet S-7, the pay item note for pay items 711-14-560 and 711-14-570 shall include black contrast block, since the design speed is greater than 45 mph (60mph) in the concrete pavement portions of both SR-52 and US-41.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/5/2019 4:29:24 PM
Question:	26300: For the wall thickness on the steel casing, are we to use the detail in the plans or are we going with .500 wall thickness on all steel casing pipe? Thanks	Posted:	6/5/2019 3:50:37 PM
Answer:	For the minimum allowed wall thickness for steel casing materials on the utility portion of the project, use Detail G7 on UWHC plan sheet U-40.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/6/2019 5:25:01 PM
Question:	26315: The Steel Sheet Pile Wall, Cantilever Data Table found on plan sheet 742 shows that the sheet pile wall from station 488+50.00, 132.69LT to 491+10.00, 130.27LT must have a moment of inertia of 2552 in^4/ft. This is an extremely high value and is inconsistent with the other walls. Please confirm that this is correct. Thank you.	Posted:	6/6/2019 2:42:13 PM
Answer:	On Sheet 742, construction information in the data table for the wall beginning at 488+50.00 and ending at 491+10.00 shall be updated to require a minimum section modulus of 46 in3/ft for A-328 steel, a minimum section modulus of 58 in3/ft for A-572 steel, and a minimum required moment of inertia of 676 in4/ft. The Contractor shall bid this revised Section Modulus and Moment of Inertia.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/7/2019 5:40:28 PM

Question:	26323: In the Steel Sheet Pile Wall Cantilever Data Table, Sheet 742, it shows that the sheet pile wall from sta. 488+50.00 to 491+10.00 has to have an extremely high moment of inertia. In order to get a moment of inertia that high, a combi-wall or an interlocking pipe pile wall would be required and, with the walls proximity to the ROW, it does not appear that there would not be enough room to accommodate the structural members of the wall for either type of wall. Is the moment of inertia provided in the table correct? If so, we are unsure as to how to bid the installation of this particular wall.	Posted:	6/7/2019 9:14:18 AM

Answer:	On Sheet 742, construction information in the data table for the wall beginning at 488+50.00 and ending at 491+10.00 shall be updated to require a minimum section modulus of 46 in3/ft for A-328 steel, a minimum section modulus of 58 in3/ft for A-572 steel, and a minimum required moment of inertia of 676 in4/ft. The Contractor shall bid this revised Section Modulus and Moment of Inertia.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/7/2019 5:41:33 PM

Question:	26324: In your answer to Question ID 26238 regarding the missing pipe and MES callout, part of your response was "Quantity needs to be added along with 2 - 18" MES.". Where doe sit need to be added? Since this quantity was not on the Roadway Plans and does not appear to be included in the Summary of Quantities, is this footage of pipe and the 2 - 18" MES included in your pay item quantities?	Posted:	6/7/2019 9:35:15 AM

Answer:	Bid the pay items based on the quantity provided in the Proposal Summary of Pay Items on the Summary of Pay Items sheet 7. Final quantities will be determined per Standard Specification 430-12 (Basis of Payment for Pipe Culverts).	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/7/2019 11:49:20 AM

Question:	26327: Project calls out wick drain being installed from station 1600+40 to 1600+80 and 1601+30 to 1601+40. There is a culvert being installed between those station after surcharge and settlement completion. What is the reason for not installing wick drains in between those areas where the organic soils are the deepest and worst. Boring BC-1600+88 shows organics to an of Elevation of -44. The Spec includes material properties for Vertical and Horizontal drains. There is no other information regarding the usage of horizontal drains in the spec and plans. If horizontal drains are required for the project, please provide full details. Project Plans and Specs state that Wicks will be installed to an elevation of -9. However, boring BC 1600+88 shows the organics extend to -44. Will the Wick Drain Contractor need to provide equipment capable of install wick to a depth of 120 to 125 feet deep to reach an elevation of -44 ft.	Posted:	6/7/2019 11:15:52 AM

Answer:	The wick drains have been designed to be placed beneath the surcharge embankments to accelerate consolidation beneath the surcharge embankments. Wick drains were intentionally not placed beneath the footprint of the culvert. The project plans and specifications require the wick drains to extend to an elevation of - 9 feet. The wick drain contractor will not need to provide equipment capable of installing the wick drains to a depth of 120 to 125 feet deep.	Status: Posted:	ANSWER PUBLISHED 6/8/2019 12:13:38 PM