



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 9/25/2019 12:41:12 PM

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

District Phone: (386) 961-7434

Proposal: T2749

Project: 439467-1-52-01

Letting Date: 9/25/2019

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 202 (J TURNER BUTLER BLVD)

Question: 27182: Can the Department provide the CAD file for the DTMtriangles of the existing ground? We cannot find the data in the GDTMRD01 file in the roadway folder, and we do not have a way to open the GDTMRD01.tin and GDTMRD02.tin files in the survey folder. Posted: 8/28/2019 7:41:24 AM

Answer: The DTM triangles are located within the GDTMRD01.dgn file. Please ensure that the file is not in read only mode and the triangles can be accessed and toggled on from the properties tool. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/6/2019 8:09:03 AM

Question: 27183: Can the Department provide the full Geotech report for the project as prepared by CSI Geo? Posted: 8/28/2019 7:43:45 AM

Answer: Please see online ordering site for requested files. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 8/30/2019 3:20:35 PM

Question: 27261: Sheet U-5, 12" WM Relocation, Restraint of Existing WM: Will the existing main be tied back with split restraints or will a thrust block at each end be acceptable? Please advise. Posted: 9/3/2019 10:53:06 AM

Answer: Split restraints are acceptable. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/11/2019 11:07:23 AM

Question: 27262: Request pavement coring data &/or as-builts be provided for the Ramps & for the San Pablo Road section that are w/in the project const limits. Posted: 9/3/2019 11:11:57 AM

Answer: Coring data has been put on the online ordering site. Original as-builts are not available. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/5/2019 4:48:08 PM

Question: 27267: Sheet U-6; Call out "Remove Exist. 24" WM from Approx. sta. 38+00 to 38+22" is typical for multiple instances. Please define whether the remaining segments of lines will require caps, and if required, how the caps will be paid. Posted: 9/3/2019 1:56:49 PM

Answer: Any remaining segment of line will require caps. Cost for caps shall be included in the unit price bid for REMOVAL-PIPELINES. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/13/2019 11:35:52 AM

Question: 27268: Sheet U-5/6, 24" WM Relocation, Restraint of Existing WM: Will the existing main be tied back with split restraints or will a thrust block at each end be acceptable? Please advise. Posted: 9/3/2019 2:40:45 PM

Answer: Split restraints are acceptable. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/11/2019 12:28:50 PM

Question: 27340: Please provide profile views for Contract Plans 439467-1-56-01. Posted: 9/5/2019 9:34:30 AM

Answer: This information is not available. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/5/2019 10:13:49 AM

Question: 27343: Can the Department provide the Table A for both the 439467-1-52-01 and 439467-1-56-01 projects in an Excel format? Posted: 9/5/2019 10:37:07 AM

Answer: The information has been posted to the online ordering site. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/5/2019 12:53:07 PM

Question: 27355: It appears the force main work on U-5 from 33+59 to 33+76 may not be included in the bid item qtys. Please confirm. Posted: 9/5/2019 2:46:23 PM

Answer: Please bid plans as shown. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/11/2019 12:27:07 PM

Question: 27356: Under Fin # 439467-1-56-01, Bid Item 27 is for 4 Each Thrust Block, 12" however no thrust blocks are shown on drawings. Posted: 9/5/2019 2:49:44 PM
Please define the locations and depth from existing grade for each of the proposed thrust blocks.

Answer: Please see Revised Table A. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/17/2019 10:05:54 AM

Question: 27358: Fin # 439467-1-56-01, Bid Item 26 - Restrainers specifically for PVC Pipe, 12"; Qty = 56 Each. Posted: 9/5/2019 3:14:37 PM
Please define if this item is for each gland, or if it is intended to cover both glands of a bell restraint. We are only coming up with approximately one half of the bid item qty.

Answer: This item was estimated per gland. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/13/2019 11:39:32 AM

Question: 27390: The JEA Table A has a qty of 1504 LF of 12" WM, but only about one half of this qty was found. Please clarify. Posted: 9/6/2019 9:56:20 AM

Answer: Please see Revised Table A. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/17/2019 10:06:17 AM

Question: 27391: JEA Table A qty's for 12" restrainers and 12" grout fill also appear to be much greater than shown on plans. Please clarify. Posted: 9/6/2019 9:59:23 AM

Answer: Please see Revised Table A. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/17/2019 10:06:36 AM

Question: 27395: The JEA plans call out removal of out of service pipe. Is the pipe empty and will caps be required where the pipe is left in place? Posted: 9/6/2019 11:00:41 AM

Answer:	The contents of the pipe, if any are unknown. Any remaining segment of line will require caps. Cost for caps shall be included in the unit price bid for REMOVAL-PIPELINES.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/13/2019 11:41:16 AM
Question:	27398: Bid Item 425-1-511 DBI, Ty D, Qty = 4. Only one of these are P bottom, the other 3 are J's. Add a bid Item for DBI, D-J to accommodate these structures.	Posted: 9/6/2019 4:09:32 PM
Answer:	The quantity and inlet types are appropriate as shown in the plans.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/13/2019 11:42:16 AM
Question:	27405: The Legend on TCP shts 181 & 182(Ph1/Stg3) refer to "Asphalt Pavement - Previous Phase" as being the light shaded areas. This previous phase would apparently be Ph1/Stg2. The Ph 1/Stg2 TCP Notes on sht 176 don't appear to call out this "Asphalt pavement" & no Ph1/Stg2 plan sheets were provided to show this work being done. Pls confirm that this work is to be done in Ph1/Stg2 & if this pavement is intended to be Permanent pavement? If it's not Perm pavt then is it to be Temp Pavement?	Posted: 9/9/2019 3:52:08 PM
Answer:	The light shaded areas shown on the Ph I/Stg 3 plan sheets are permanent asphalt constructed during the previous stage and called out in Notes 2 & 3 in the phasing notes for Ph I/Stg 2 as "Roadway Improvements at Marina San Pablo PI" & "Areas of the WEST SIDE of San Pablo Rd noted in plans".	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/11/2019 11:41:47 AM
Question:	27406: Will the temporary sod needed adjacent to any of the special detours be paid under item 0570-1-2? In some projects it has been included w/in the permanent pay item work.	Posted: 9/9/2019 4:43:02 PM
Answer:	See Specification Section 570.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/11/2019 11:40:16 AM
Question:	27416: On Ramp D-2, the plan sheets call for mill & resurface to the left of the Base Line of Construction from Station 1065+34.21 to 1084+00. The cross sections for these stations show full depth reconstruction. Which do we use and how does it affect the quantities of earthwork, stabilization, base, asphalt,milling and resurfacing?	Posted: 9/10/2019 11:34:33 AM
Answer:	Please bid plans as shown.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/19/2019 8:09:57 AM

Question: 27421: Please refer to note 1 on sheet 123 "TEMPORARY SHEETING AND DEWATERING WILL BE REQUIRED TO COMPACT THE EXPOSED SUBGRADE AT THE BOTTOM OF THE EXCAVATION AND IN ORDER TO INSTALL THE GEOSYNTHETIC MATERIAL IN THE DRY". Can the contractor elect to use other methods, in lieu of sheeting, to construct the reinforced slope in the dry? Posted: 9/10/2019 4:01:58 PM

Answer: The Contractor can elect to use other methods of construction. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/12/2019 6:57:03 AM

Question: 27422: Please refer to note 2 on sheet 123 "TEMPORARY SLOPE BRACING OR SHEETING WILL BE REQUIRED FOR EXCAVATIONS EXCEEDING 4 FEET IN HEIGHT". Can the contractor elect to open cut the excavation, in lieu of support of excavation, if a slope w/in OSHA guidelines is attainable? Posted: 9/10/2019 4:06:21 PM

Answer: The Contractor can elect to use other methods of construction. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/12/2019 6:50:58 AM

Question: 27423: What is the invert elevation of the existing Box culvert at the construction location of the Reinforced Slope(Ref plan sht #122)? Posted: 9/10/2019 4:09:36 PM

Answer: Invert elevations can be found in the topo design file along with the .tin file. The invert elevations for the existing box culvert are also shown on plan sheet 72 near the callout for "S-416." Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/12/2019 6:47:43 AM

Question: 27428: The Summary of Temporary Signalization & Detection on sheet SQ-7 shows 1 temporary signal for the full duration of Phase 1 (Stages 1, 2, 3, and 4). Where is this temporary signal used as it is not shown in the Maintenance of Traffic plans for Stages 1, 2 and 3? Posted: 9/11/2019 8:49:37 AM

Answer: The temporary signal needed during Phase 1 Stages 1-4 is located at STA 33+60 RT (i.e. the proposed mast arm 2-3). The proposed mast arm is to be constructed in Phase I Stage 1 to accommodate the removal of the existing mast arm. The proposed mast arm is needed throughout the TCP and adjustments from phase to phase constitute the temporary signal effort. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/12/2019 6:48:57 AM

Question:	27429: Sheet SQ-2 shows the duration of Phase 1 Stage 1 as 15 days. The work in this phase includes the installation of mast arm 2-3. After installation of the mast arm FOUNDATION and preparation of as-built drawings, the time required for shop drawing preparation and approval as well as fabrication and delivery of the mast arm structure is 90-120 calendar days. Is a procurement period going to be provided for this long lead time item?	Posted:	9/11/2019 8:50:25 AM
Answer:	Within the constraints of the existing contract time, TTC Phasing times can be adjusted as needed in accordance with the Contractor's CPM schedule that was accepted by the Department.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/13/2019 12:00:44 PM
Question:	27430: Sheet SQ-2 shows the duration of Phase 1 Stage 1 as 15 days. The work in this phase includes the construction of Special Detour 1 at Ramps A and C. The detour at Ramp C cannot be constructed until after new mast arm 2-3 is installed and the existing mast arm structure removed. Procurement for the new mast arm is 90-120 days after installation of the foundation. How is this accommodated within the Department's schedule for the project?	Posted:	9/11/2019 8:51:11 AM
Answer:	Within the constraints of the existing contract time, TTC Phasing times can be adjusted as needed in accordance with the Contractor's CPM schedule that was accepted by the Department.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/13/2019 12:01:34 PM
Question:	27431: Can a temporary signal be used in Phase 1 Stages 1, 2, and 3 at Ramp C to allow the existing mast arm structure to be removed prior to mast arm 2-3 being installed? Will the Department pay for the temporary signalization at this location?	Posted:	9/11/2019 8:51:59 AM
Answer:	The Contractor can elect to use other methods of construction with Engineer's approval. Please see Spec 102 for payment.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/19/2019 8:08:57 AM
Question:	27433: Ref response to question 27262, the CSI Geotech Report does not appear to include any Coring data for the existing Pavements. Does the Dept. have any Coring data for these existing pavements, i.e. to know the exist asphalt & base thicknesses, the base matls used, etc.? This is relevant since these pavt areas will have to be removed or possibly incorporated into the new work.	Posted:	9/11/2019 10:09:50 AM
Answer:	This report has been posted to online ordering.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/20/2019 8:54:28 AM

Question:	27434: Sheet SQ-2 shows the duration of Phase 1 Stage 1 as 15 days. The work in this phase includes the installation of mast arm 2-3. It appears that both the existing 12" Forcemain and 12" water line are in conflict with the mast arm foundation. These utilities are being adjusted as shown on Sheet U-5. The relocation must be completed and the required testing and agency clearances obtained before the existing locations are impacted. Will the Department increase the duration of Phase 1 Stage 1 to accommodate the full scope of work required in this phase?	Posted:	9/11/2019 10:36:35 AM
Answer:	Within the constraints of the existing contract time, TTC Phasing times can be adjusted as needed in accordance with the Contractor's CPM schedule that was accepted by the Department.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/13/2019 12:06:13 PM
Question:	27435: Sheet 176, Item 2. Under Phase 1 Stage 2 calls for the construction of drainage improvements under existing pavement from S-2 to S-6. There are no MOT plans for Phase 1 Stage 2. Sheet 181 Phase 1 Stage 3 does not show any of this drainage installed yet, but it is shown on sheet 187 Phase 1 Stage 4. When is this drainage to be installed? Please revise the MOT plans as needed.	Posted:	9/11/2019 3:02:59 PM
Answer:	The intent of Phase I Stage 2 is to construct the drainage improvements proposed underneath the existing pavement, lane-by-lane, utilizing SPI for single lane closures.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/20/2019 8:57:11 AM
Question:	27436: On sheet 187 Phase 1 Stage 4 structure S-1 and the pipe to S-2 is shown installed. When is the pipe under the existing pavement of San Pablo Rd. to be installed? Please revise the MOT plans as needed.	Posted:	9/11/2019 3:03:52 PM
Answer:	The intent of Phase I Stage 2 is to construct the drainage improvements proposed underneath the existing pavement, lane-by-lane, utilizing SPI for single lane closures.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/20/2019 8:56:52 AM
Question:	27437: Sheet 176, Item 2. Under Phase 1 Stage 2 calls for the construction of drainage improvements under existing pavement from S-12 to S-16. There are no MOT plans for Phase 1 Stage 2. Sheet 182 Phase 1 Stage 3 does not show any of this drainage installed yet. On sheet 188 Phase 1 Stage 4, the work zone shown allows the construction of S-12, S-302 to S-301 to S-14, S-433 to S-434 to S-435 to S-15 to S-16. When is this drainage to be installed, in Stage 2, Stage 3 or Stage 4? Please revise the MOT plans as needed.	Posted:	9/11/2019 3:05:40 PM
Answer:	The intent of Phase I Stage 2 is to construct the drainage improvements proposed underneath the existing pavement, lane-by-lane, utilizing SPI for single lane closures.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/20/2019 8:57:32 AM

Question:	27438: On sheet 188 Phase 1 Stage 4 it shows S-14 installed and S-15 installed but not the pipe crossing between the two under the existing pavement. When is this pipe to be installed?	Posted:	9/11/2019 3:06:40 PM
Answer:	The intent of Phase I Stage 2 is to construct the drainage improvements proposed underneath the existing pavement, lane-by-lane, utilizing SPI for single lane closures.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/20/2019 8:58:18 AM
Question:	27456: Sheet SQ-12, Pay Items 0125-1 and 0125-3: Location/Stationing for this work was omitted from SQ sheet. Please provide location/stationing.	Posted:	9/13/2019 2:49:04 PM
Answer:	Callouts for 'Excavation For Structures' and 'Select Bedding Material' are provided in the Ramp D-2 cross section sheets.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/17/2019 3:23:20 PM
Question:	27457: Is all existing drainage to remain unless called for removal? It appears there is existing pipe not called for removal but the inlets on the pipe are called to be removed (example see sheet 53).	Posted:	9/13/2019 2:56:19 PM
Answer:	Existing drainage items within the limits of clearing & grubbing is to be removed unless called out 'To Remain' in the plans.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/17/2019 10:10:09 AM
Question:	27464: FDOT project plans will occasionally have x-sections of special detours or temp pavt conditions, especially if significant excavation &/or embankment is needed. These plans do not presently include this information. Request the dept. provide any files or plans that include the x-sections for all of the special detour areas, esp. for the Ph1/Stg4, Special Detours along Ramps A1 & C2.	Posted:	9/16/2019 5:53:41 PM
Answer:	Requested files were not created.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	9/17/2019 10:09:16 AM
Question:	27465: TTCP Plan sht 187 calls out the placement of a temp drainage line in the Ramp A area. A curved drainage line is shown. Request that the size & type of drainage line for this work be provided. And what temp end treatments(i.e., MES, etc.), if any, are required for this temp drainage line.	Posted:	9/17/2019 6:38:16 AM

Answer:	The intent of this 'Temporary Drainage' is to use an inlet protection system mounted on the pavement surface to direct stormwater flow from Ramp A away from the temporary intersection and into the proposed drainage system at S-108. The temporary drainage is incidental to the MOT activities and should be included as part of the Maintenance of Traffic LS pay item 102-1.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/20/2019 9:03:28 AM
Question:	27467: On sheet 187 there is a callout for "Temporary Drainage". The leader line appears to point to a line of linked circles not addressed by the legend. What exactly is the intent of this "Temporary Drainage"?	Posted: 9/17/2019 8:37:28 AM
Answer:	The design intent is to use sand bags to temporarily deflect runoff, not using them as a true inlet protection system. The temporary drainage is incidental to the MOT activities and include these sandbags as part of the Maintenance of Traffic LS pay item 102-1.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/20/2019 9:14:20 AM
Question:	27469: Ramp D-2 Sta +/-1085+00 (typical) shows existing drainage pipe and structures within the widening of the ramp. Is this drainage pipe and structures to be removed or to remain?	Posted: 9/17/2019 10:05:11 AM
Answer:	Existing drainage pipe and structures within the widening of the ramp should be removed unless identified to remain.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/17/2019 2:29:00 PM
Question:	27476: The Utility Work Schedule for JEA Electric Distribution shows new facilities being installed between 34+70 and 35+24 in Phase 1 Stage 4. Can JEA perform this work during Phase 1 Stages 1A and 1B?	Posted: 9/17/2019 1:56:14 PM
Answer:	See Section B of the UWS.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/17/2019 3:28:50 PM
Question:	27482: Question 27261 stated that split restraints are acceptable for restraining existing 12" WM. Please define how the restraints will be paid and what qty will be required.	Posted: 9/17/2019 2:51:48 PM
Answer:	The pay item is for each gland of a bell restraint. Therefore, each connection will contain two glands.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 9/20/2019 9:01:09 AM
Question:	27483: Question 27261 and 27268 bot state split restraints as acceptable for restraint of existing mains. Please define how the restraints will be paid and how many are required.	Posted: 9/17/2019 2:54:20 PM

Answer:	The pay item is for each gland of a bell restraint. Therefore, each connection will contain two glands.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 9/20/2019 9:00:41 AM
Question:	27484: Question 27340 was answered with "This information is not available". Based on this response, bids will be based on all work under 439467-1-56-01 to be at minimum cover and any additional depth of cover will be compensated commensurately. Please confirm.	Posted: 9/17/2019 3:00:48 PM
Answer:	Yes.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 9/20/2019 9:06:55 AM
Question:	27492: Re bid item 0571-1-13, Plastic Erosion Mat: The bid quantity of 265sy appears to be based on 265' length * a 9' width/height. The actual width of the slopes seem to be approx. 15' based on the cross-sections for this affected area. So the actual area would be ~445sy. Will the final payment be based on the measured area of the plastic erosion mat actually placed on the 1:1 slopes?	Posted: 9/18/2019 8:46:28 AM
Answer:	Please see Spec 571.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 9/20/2019 9:08:03 AM
Question:	27493: What is the size of the Dbl concrete box culvert at Ramp D2 station 1102+00?	Posted: 9/18/2019 9:02:25 AM
Answer:	Two 8'X4'.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 9/20/2019 8:59:16 AM
Question:	27494: Please provide the design documents and calculations for the Reinforced Slope.	Posted: 9/18/2019 10:29:58 AM
Answer:	Please see the Roadway Geotechnical Exploration and Evaluation Report, Revision 03 dated May 14, 2019.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 9/18/2019 2:59:23 PM
Question:	27495: Please provide an example where the Reinforced Slope was previously constructed to enable inspection prior to bid date.	Posted: 9/18/2019 10:47:01 AM

Answer: FIN 435510-1, SR 207 Trail, St. Johns County SR 207/ RAIL TRAIL FROM CR 305 TO MOCCASIN BRANCH
FIN 426392-3, SR 100 Trail, Putnam County SR 100 FROM E OF GOODSON PRAIRIE ROAD TO PALMETTO BRANCH TRIBUTARY

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/20/2019 9:13:37 AM

Question: 27498: Under which pay items will the excavation and embankment for the Reinforced Slope be paid ?

Posted: 9/18/2019 12:04:46 PM

Answer: The pay items for excavation and embankment for the reinforced slope include 0120-1, Regular Excavation, 0125-1, Excavation for Structures and 0125-6, Select Bedding Material.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/20/2019 7:52:21 AM

Question: 27499: In the pay item 0544-3-1 there are no design speeds listed for the (3) permanent crash cushions. Could you please provide the design speed for the three locations?

Posted: 9/18/2019 12:23:42 PM

Answer: The design speeds for the three permanent crash cushions can be found in the 'Traffic Data' section of the Typical Section sheets.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 9/18/2019 3:00:16 PM