



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time: 11/18/2020 8:16:59 AM

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

District Phone: (386) 943-5350

Proposal: T5704

Project: 441133-1-52-01

Letting Date: 11/18/2020

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 9 (I-95)

Question: 31300: Per specification 102-7 TRAFFIC CONTROL OFFICER, Uniformed law enforcement officers will be required on this project and payment as per specification 102-11.2 by the department. Posted: 10/8/2020 1:48:13 PM

Will the department be adding pay item 102-14 to this contract to pay for the officers required for lane closures and traffic pacing per index 102-070 note 10?(equipment across active lanes)

Answer: Pay Item has been added. See Plans Revision Number 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/29/2020 9:49:58 AM

Question: 31324: Request the Dept. provide Pavement Coring data for the paved shoulders & ramp(s) that are to be removed. And any Geotech information available for the project site. Thank you. Posted: 10/12/2020 9:50:05 AM

Answer: Coring data is available for reference at the following website: <https://www.fdot.gov/materials/pavement/coringdata/D5/77/default.shtm>. Copy of Geotech information is attached: Roadway Soil Survey Report Widening of Ramps 71 and 72 SR 9(I-95)/LPGA Boulevard Interchange. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 10/14/2020 11:36:40 AM

Document: 10766467: Rdwy Soil Survey Report I 95 Interchange 441133-1.pdf

Roadway Soil Survey Report I-95 Interchange

Question: 31326: No cross-sections were provided for the earthwork. The CAD files do not offer enough information to confirm & identify the cut & fill quantities for each earthwork location or the balances within the earthwork loc's(i.e. @ Ramp #72). Request that Cross-section pdf's be provided for all the bid item 120-1 & 120-6 work areas. Thank you Posted: 10/12/2020 11:09:45 AM

Answer:	Refer to Special Provisions, Excavation and Embankment (Page 36) of the Specifications Package, for clarification.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/14/2020 11:38:39 AM
Question:	31339: Excavation & some placement of backfill Embankment will be required at the construction of bid item 0521-72-56. Since there are no provided cross-sections, are these earthwork quantities included in bid items 0120-1 & 0120-6? If not, will this work still be paid thru the unit prices for these 2ea. bid items?	Posted: 10/13/2020 8:15:47 AM
Answer:	Quantities for Pay Item 0120-1 have been revised. See Plans Revision Number 1.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/29/2020 9:52:02 AM
Question:	31346: Please clarify Typical Section 6, Sheet 11 Ramp #72 shoulder widening states 2" SP TLC (PG76-22). There is no SP TLC PG 76-22 pay item. Should this be non poly SP TLC?	Posted: 10/13/2020 11:20:16 AM
Answer:	Reference of PG 76-22 was removed from the note. See Plans Revision Number 1.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/29/2020 9:53:10 AM
Question:	31418: Requesting a separate pay item for the GNSS rovers. Per specification 5-7.6 the Contractor is to supply a minimum of four (4) GNSS rovers and cost to be applied to respective pay items requiring layout. Issuing a separate pay item for the rovers helps mitigate the cost of replacement or repair should the rovers be damaged or lost during construction. Additionally, because pay items such as asphalt are adjusted based on the bituminous prices, it is impossible to include the price of rovers without loss to the Contractor.	Posted: 10/16/2020 10:29:25 AM
Answer:	A separate pay item for GNSS rovers will not be provided. Refer to Special Provisions, Section 5-7.8, and Section 9 of the Standard Specifications.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/27/2020 2:05:20 PM
Question:	31448: It appears that excav & embankment is needed at the reconst work shown on sht 49. These CY quans aren't shown on Summary of Earthwork, sht SQ-5. What are the Reg Excav & Embank CY quans for the work in these areas, if available?	Posted: 10/20/2020 8:28:38 AM

Answer:	Quantities have been revised. See Plans Revision Number 1.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/29/2020 9:54:12 AM
Question:	<p>31494: Ref plan sht #38 Section A-A Detail, the outside ~7.5' of the exist I-95 SB OL shldr is to be removed & replaced with Perf Turf. The provided Pavt Eval & Condition Rpt indicates(ref MP 32.771 & 31.882) an avg 5.2" of Asph pavt layer + avg 6.4" of SAHMS Base = avg 11.6" of exist shldr pavt in the above area.</p> <p>This pavt removal cost is to be incl'd in bid item 0110-1-1; & this pavt remvl vol is not to be incl'd in the Reg Excav quantity.</p> <p>The est'd pavt removal area for this loc is ~1,100sy. At ~11.6" thk of exist shldr pavt the resulting removal volume ~> 354cy.</p> <p>The est'd quantity of Embank to replace this vol of pavt removal, less ~2" thk new Sod(61cy) => 293cy of Embank needed to replace the removed shldr pavt. The Sum of Earthwork for the Ramp #74 area, which supposedly incls the above area, only has an est'd 16cy of Embank for all of the Ramp #74 area. Request this be confirmed and, if agree, then should the Embank quan be increased to include the above est addn'l embank vol?</p>	Posted: 10/21/2020 4:11:21 PM
Answer:	See response to Question ID 31448.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/29/2020 9:55:22 AM
Question:	<p>31500: Plan sht 11, Typ Sect 6(Ramp #72) has a callout to See Detail F. This callout points to the new 10' wide paved shldr. Detail F seems to only intend to address 300' of Ditch Regrade work, to be done from sta. 2008 -> 2011. This ditch regrade is also called out on sht #44 @ 0.20 ac. Pls confirm that the ditch regrade work's only from sta. 2008 -> 2011 = 300'.</p>	Posted: 10/22/2020 9:59:26 AM
Answer:	Given the nature of the project, refer to the BIM Files (MODLRD08) to see the entire cut/fill areas and intent of work for Ramp #72.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/27/2020 2:06:35 PM
Question:	<p>31518: Confirming per specification 327-2 & 330-5.1, milling and paving will NOT require AMG for standard resurfacing.</p> <p>AMG is ONLY required in overbuild and base paving areas.</p>	Posted: 10/26/2020 12:55:29 PM
Answer:	Per Special Provision Section 330, AMG is required for overbuild and base paving areas. Per Special Provision 327, AMG is required for milling.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 10/27/2020 2:07:39 PM

Question:	31549: Ref Addendum #2, sht SQ-5, the Summary of Earthwork does not show the Reg Excav & Embank quantities by location. The original Sum of Earthwork, as in the plans on other FDOT projects, provided these breakouts. Since the Reg Excav bid quan has been substantially increased, request that a revised Summary of Earthwork by provided that will show the new Reg Excav quantity broken out by location(Ramp #_, Pier Protection Wall, SR-9 ramp tie-ins at SR-40, SR-9 paved shldr removal[shts 37->39], XS Corrections).	Posted:	10/29/2020 8:30:26 AM
Answer:	Refer to the BIM Files included in the Contract Documents.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	11/5/2020 12:25:32 PM
Question:	31550: Ref shts 15->18, Overbuild & Resurfacing Details: Embankment is shown to be typically needed/placed adjacent to the IR paved shldrs. It's not specifically called out, but, are these locations (~3,300') to receive Type II Shldr Treatments(stdn plan index 570-010)?	Posted:	10/29/2020 8:41:43 AM
Answer:	Shoulder Treatment (Standard Plans Index 570-010) is not included in this contract. Embankment and Sod will be paid as separate pay items.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	11/5/2020 2:41:56 PM
Question:	31551: Request a TTCP Detail be provided for the shoulder pavt removal work on SR-9 SB OL shown on shts 37 -> 39. TTCP Details were provided for the other reconst locations.	Posted:	10/29/2020 9:28:19 AM
Answer:	See notes on TTC Plan Notes sheet under Phase Notes.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	11/5/2020 12:27:18 PM
Question:	31552: Pls confirm that the Pavement Removal volumes are not included in the new Reg Excav CY (102-1)quantities. That costs assoc'd with the removal of the existing pavts, per spec section 110 are to be included in bid item 110-1-1, Clear & Grub.	Posted:	10/29/2020 9:53:04 AM
Answer:	Refer to the Summary of Clearing and Grubbing & Removal Items table within the Summary of Quantities sheets.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	11/5/2020 12:28:56 PM
Question:	31553: There is no quantity for detectable warning on SQ-17 or contract 527-2 pay item on the project. Please add pay item and associated quantities to this project.	Posted:	10/29/2020 11:11:38 AM

Answer:	At this time, Detectable Warnings are not included in this contract and will be added by others.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 11/5/2020 12:30:16 PM
Question:	31555: Since per special provision 5-7.6 we are to provide the department with a minimum of four GNSS rovers for use during the duration of the contract, does this mean the department's personnel will be responsible for all daily relocation/calibrations?	Posted: 10/29/2020 1:33:53 PM
Answer:	Refer to Special Provisions 5-7.3 of the Specifications Package.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 11/5/2020 12:31:22 PM
Question:	31556: With response to question 31518, Clarification of AGM milling requirements for this project was intended for ALL milling, including the constant depth milling which comprises the majority of this 6.3 mile-8 Lane resurfacing project. This seems like an overabundance on straight forward depth resurfacing areas. Please confirm if this was intended for ALL milling and not just the slope correction areas.	Posted: 10/29/2020 1:50:36 PM
Answer:	AMG is required for ALL milling operations.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 11/5/2020 12:32:27 PM
Question:	31594: Please confirm the lane closure and ramp closures for SR 40 and Ramps related to the curb ramp/flatwork at ramps 67,68 & 69.	Posted: 11/3/2020 10:04:27 AM
Answer:	Refer to TTC Plan Notes sheet and TTC Ramp Closure Detour sheets.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted: 11/5/2020 1:40:03 PM
Question:	31595: Re Typ Sects 1, 2, 3, 4 & 6: 2'-8" width of Sod is shown to be placed along certain edge-of-pavt locations. This requirement is normally, on other FDOT projects, assoc'd with Ty I Shldr Treatment; and which is openly called out on the Typ Sections. Please confirm if the intent of the work at these 2'-8" wide areas is to comply w/ Stnd Plan Index 570-010 for Ty I Shldr Treatment; and w/ Stnd Spec Section 570-3.8.	Posted: 11/3/2020 1:46:43 PM

Answer: See response to Question ID 31550. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/5/2020 2:42:46 PM

Question: 31653: Ref TTC Plan notes(sht #56) 7, 8, 9 & 10: That the Ramp #74 detour may be permitted for no more than 3 "consecutive" days, is this to say that this temp detour is permitted for no more than 3ea. CONTINUOUS 24hr. periods = the 3ea. days? And that the Ramp #69 detour is permitted for no more than 2ea. continuous 24hr. periods = the 2ea. days. That these ramps can be closed continuously is important for the Construction opn work at these locations. Posted: 11/10/2020 8:32:09 AM

Answer: Per Note 8, Ramp #74 may be closed for three consecutive days (72 continuous hours). Per Note 7, closures for all other ramps, including Ramp #69, are not permitted between the hours 6 AM to 10 PM and for no more than two consecutive days. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/13/2020 1:56:20 PM

Question: 31673: Just confirming that DAYTIME (no restrictions) shoulder closures will be allowed per index 102-010 Posted: 11/12/2020 9:09:55 AM

Answer: Index 102-010 does not exist in the FY 2020-2021 Standard Plans. Refer to TTC Plan Notes sheet and the FY 2020-2021 Standard Plans. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/13/2020 1:57:48 PM

Question: 31674: Ref TTC Typical Pier Protection Barrier on sht #57: The width of the project specific PPW Footing is called out to be 6.0' wide from the back of the wall. Std Plan Index 521-002(sht 6 of 8) shows this std width to be 7.0'. Pls confirm that the intending const width of the PPW Ftg on this project is to be 6.0'. And that all other PPW dimensions are to be per the ref'd Std Plan Index. Posted: 11/12/2020 9:23:25 AM

Answer: The 6' shown on Sheet 57 is for the shoulder reconstruction and placement of the barrier. However, the 6' does not correlate to the footer dimension. Refer to Standard Plans Index 521-002. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 11/13/2020 1:59:21 PM