



Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

6/9/2021 8:11:52 AM

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

District Phone: (386) 961-7434

Proposal: T2793

Project: 434615-1-52-01

Letting Date: 6/9/2021

Localtion: CENTRAL OFFICE

Description: SR 9 (I-95)

Question: 33975: Please reference sheet TCP11. The plan shows an unidentified pipe with two mitered ends south of drainage structure S-301. In order to cost it correctly, please clarify the intended drainage conveyance and size of pipe required. Posted: 5/6/2021 2:02:58 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:11:37 PM

Question: 33976: Please reference sheet 45 and TCP 11 of SR16 plan set. The plan shows constructing temporary pavement in the median from +/- 22+00 to 26+60 RT. There are two existing curb inlets identified as 37 and 38 that will have to be removed to pave the median. Please verify that temporary drainage structures (maybe F inlets) are not required to maintain drainage in this area. Posted: 5/6/2021 2:47:52 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:12:02 PM

Question: 33978: Please reference sheet TCP 12 for SR16 construction. Drainage manholes S206,209,212,215,218,and 220 are to be constructed in phase 1a. Presumably, these will be constructed to TCP pavement elevations. Please verify that no additional payment will be made to adjust the manhole tops to final elevations. Posted: 5/6/2021 2:48:08 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:12:35 PM

Question: 33979: Please reference sheet TCP 12 and plan sheet 45 for SR16. It appears as though the TCP requires to cap the pipe from S220 to S221. If this pipe is capped, the drainage will back up to structure S206. Please verify that the pipe cap is not required and that the intent is to allow the drainage to flow into the pond in phase 1a. Posted: 5/6/2021 4:37:07 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:12:55 PM

Question: 33985: For SR16 construction, please reference plan sheet 46 and TCP sheet 45. The existing inlet identified as 49 drains into existing pipe to be removed in order to install the proposed drainage from S227 to S237. Inlet 49 will not be functional from phase 2-1 until phase 2-3a. If this condition is not acceptable, please instruct how to bid. Posted: 5/10/2021 1:09:23 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:13:26 PM

Question: 33986: For SR16 construction, please reference TCP sheet 59. Curb Inlet S-226 will be constructed under temporary pavement. Please confirm that a temporary manhole top is required and that payment will be made under the Lump Sum MOT item for 434615-2-52-01. Posted: 5/10/2021 1:06:11 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:13:46 PM

Question: 34004: Please reference the summary of drainage structures for SR16. Structure S221 is counted as a barrier wall inlet. Plan sheet 80 shows it as a J-5 Curb inlet >10. On plan sheet 45, it appears that the structure falls within the limits of curb and gutter and should be a curb inlet. Please verify and consider revising the bid item quantities as needed. Posted: 5/10/2021 11:43:20 AM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:14:03 PM

Question: 34014: Please reference JEA pay item 16 (Remove Pipe, 8-19.9) with a quantity of 342 LF. Posted: 5/10/2021 2:32:08 PM

The plan shows the following quantities totaling approximately 533 LF.
Please verify and consider revising the pay item quantity.

SR16 EB 12" (STA 23+48 to 26+42) = 342 LF
At 8" meters (Detail #2) = 9 LF
Ramp B2 12" (STA 6202+50) = 15 LF
SR16 EB 12"(STA 34+55 to 35+40)= 95 LF
SR16 WB 8" (STA 23+15 to 23+93) = 72 LF

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 12:14:20 PM

Question: 34015: Please reference JEA pay item 15 (Remove Pipe, 5-7.9). Please provide a station and offset to help locate the work area(s) in the plan. Posted: 5/10/2021 2:39:29 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 12:14:54 PM

Question: 34016: Details 5 and 6 of the JEA utility plan for SR16 shows a 4" thick, 2.5' wide concrete cap over 119 LF of 16" water main. Please verify that concrete cap is to be paid for under JEA bid item 13 (16" HDPE Water). Also, please verify that no reinforcement will be required. Posted: 5/10/2021 2:49:31 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 12:15:09 PM

Question: 34017: Please reference detail 6 of the JEA utility plan. The 10 inch branch line between the tee and the 90 bend intersects the existing water main. It is likely that the 10 inch line will need to be offset under the existing line using elbows. If required, will the contractor be compensated for additional fittings, or will fittings be added to the pay items prior to the bid? Posted: 5/10/2021 3:03:54 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 12:15:26 PM

Question: 34018: On sheet U-5 of the JEA utility plan at station 235 (between details 5 and 6). The 10 inch water line is to be run to the existing meter. Between the 90 bend and meter, the line seems to make another bend toward the southwest. Please verify that additional elbows are not required to make that turn. Posted: 5/10/2021 3:08:16 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:15:42 PM

Question: 34021: Please reference sheet U-5 of the JEA utility plan for SR16. At station +/- 234+80 RT, the proposed 10" water is shown to connect to an existing 8" meter assembly. Please verify the that any material required to make that connection (10x8 reducer) is to be incidental to bid item 11 (8" HDPE Water). Posted: 5/10/2021 3:48:36 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:15:55 PM

Question: 34022: Please reference details 1 and 2 of the JEA utility plan for SR16. The 2 inch water services shown in the details show a gate valve adjacent to the service saddle with corp. stop. The JEA bid items do not have a bid item for 2 inch gate valves. Are the 2 inch gate valves redundant and not required? Please clarify. Posted: 5/10/2021 4:08:33 PM

Answer: Please see Revision 1. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 12:16:29 PM

Question: 34025: In order to better understand the clearing and grubbing scope for trees & vegetation, can the department provide a KMZ file for SR16. If possible, can the KMZ file be limited in size and contain only the layers used to produce the ROADWAY PLAN SHEETS? Posted: 5/10/2021 4:28:01 PM

Answer: The file has been posted to CPP online ordering. Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED
Posted: 6/3/2021 2:03:47 PM

Answer: The file has bee posted to CPP online ordering. Status: ANSWER VOIDED
Posted: 6/3/2021 2:02:52 PM

Question:	34032: Please reference sheet B-22 of the structures plan for SR16. The notes require a minimum sacrificial thickness of .09 inches. In lieu of sacrificial thickness, Will the department accept coating treatments per Spec 560-11: zinc primer and coal tar epoxy?	Posted:	5/11/2021 8:29:15 AM
Answer:	The 0.09 inches of minimum sacrificial thickness shall be in addition to the coating requirements of Spec 560-11.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	6/3/2021 1:29:48 PM
Question:	34060: Please reference plan sheet BW-1 for SR9 construction (434615-1-52-01). For pier protection barrier walls on SR16 and SR9, please confirm that the contractor can select between rear flush and back flush footing options as long as it is constructed per index 521-002.	Posted:	5/12/2021 1:24:32 PM
Answer:	Please refer to Index 521-002	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/20/2021 10:52:29 AM
Question:	34096: For SR16 construction, please reference TCP sheet 1, note 8, regarding the maintenance of a 5' pedestrian path "as shown in the plans". The contractor can maintain the paths as shown in the plan, but please clarify if the contractor will have to maintain pedestrian traffic on both sides of SR16 simultaneously or just one side at a time? Please consider adding TCP notes to further define the requirements relating to maintenance of pedestrian traffic.	Posted:	5/14/2021 10:29:37 AM
Answer:	The plans provide pedestrian accommodations on both sides of SR 16. Please see Spec 102-4.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/20/2021 10:50:54 AM
Question:	34097: Will it be acceptable to detour pedestrians traffic across SR16 in order to maintain pedestrian traffic on only one side of SR16 at any given time? If not, please consider adding a TCP note addressing this restriction.	Posted:	5/14/2021 10:30:02 AM
Answer:	The plans provide pedestrian accommodations on both sides of SR 16. Please see Spec 102-4.	Status:	ANSWER PUBLISHED
		Posted:	5/20/2021 10:49:40 AM
Question:	34138: Please reference the TCP for SR16 construction. In phase 1-3a, the plan allows the contractor to close ramps A and D. Are there any duration restrictions for these closures? Can ramps be closed concurrently?	Posted:	5/14/2021 4:39:10 PM

Answer:	Please refer to TTCP General Note 4 for duration and time restrictions. The plans do not restrict concurrent ramp closures.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/20/2021 10:48:10 AM
Question:	34141: Regarding the detour plans for SR16 construction, please provide additional clarifications for their use. For example, duration restrictions, time restrictions, intended work to be performed with each detour.	Posted: 5/14/2021 4:38:55 PM
Answer:	Please refer to TTCP General Note 4 for duration and time restrictions Please refer to phasing notes for Phase 1 Stage 3A and Phase 3 stage 1 for work to be performed during each ramp detour. Please refer to phasing notes for Phase 2 for work to be performed during CR 208. Please refer to each detour for the label of which ramp / road will be closed for that detour.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 5/20/2021 10:47:16 AM
Question:	34320: For SR16 construction, please reference the summary of quantities for OBG09. Area ID 66265 seems to be missing an area of over 900 SY between the STA 26+15 and 27+20 where the FID splits. Also, area ID 65677 seems to be missing about 550 SY for the new U-Turn lane. Please verify and consider revising the bid item quantities as required.	Posted: 5/25/2021 10:23:43 AM
Answer:	The areas and quantities are correct. The shading for the milling and resurfacing shapes in question are turned off	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/3/2021 12:18:45 PM
Question:	34326: For SR9 construction, the summary of quantities for OBG9 seems to be missing about 1100 SY of area. Summary of quantities area IDs 28293 and 28262 indicate mill and resurface. However, roadway plan sheets 48 and 49 show these areas as full reconstruction with OBG9. Considering the traffic control challenges in this area, mill and resurfacing would be preferable if at all possible. Please verify and consider revising the affected pay item quantities.	Posted: 5/25/2021 10:23:52 AM
Answer:	The quantities and shapes are correct. The areas in question are milling and resurfacing. There is no pattern for the milling and resurfacing, which matches the legend.	Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED Posted: 6/3/2021 12:19:47 PM
Question:	34373: Will JEA utility fittings and fixtures be required to be domestically produced in the USA?	Posted: 5/26/2021 8:41:49 AM

Answer: Yes, St. John's County Utilities Department (SJCUD)'s fittings and fixtures will be required to be domestically produced in the USA.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 1:27:57 PM

Question: 34390: It does not appear that utility work schedules have been provided for the relocation of private utilities. Please provide in order to evaluate how private utilities will impact the project.

Posted: 5/26/2021 4:27:31 PM

Answer: Please see SP 7-11.5.3 for link to UWS.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 1:12:20 PM

Question: 34392: After performing a takeoff on the cross sections provided for SR 16 construction, it appears that the quantity of excavation and embankment required for Pond 1 has not been accounted for in the bid item quantities. Please verify and consider revising the affected bid item quantities.

Posted: 5/27/2021 10:26:52 AM

Answer: Please see Revision 2.

Status: ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 6/3/2021 12:20:28 PM