

Bid Questions and Answers Report

Date & Time:

5/26/2021 8:36:12 AM

District Address:

District 3 Construction Office, located at 1074 Highway 90 East, Chipley, FL

District Phone:

(850) 415-9713

Proposal:

T3752

Project:

441548-1-52-01

Letting Date:

5/26/2021

Localtion:

CENTRAL OFFICE

Description:

SR 85 (S FERDON BLVD)

Question:

33862: Sheet No. 21, Ramp D Widening Detail, specifies and Optional

Base Group 1. There is not a bid item for Optional Base Group 1.

Please clarify.

Answer:

Addendum forthcoming.

Status:

ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 4/30/2021 9:51:26 AM

Posted: 5/17/2021 10:49:12 AM

Question:

33887: On plan sheet no. 86 there is a note showing "Const. (2) 121 LF of 36" Pipe" between structures S-528 and S-538. This quantity of

pipe is not in the accounted for in the Summary of Drainage

Structures on Sheet No. 34. Please clarify.

Posted: 4/30/2021 4:31:10 PM

Answer:

Addendum forthcoming.

Status:

ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/17/2021 10:47:52 AM

Question:

33953: Roadway Plan Sheets 63 and 64 show the ramps and shoulders for Mcwhorter Ave as receiving Mainline Milling and Resurfacing treatment instead of the proposed Outside Turn Lane treatment as described in Typical Section 1. Please clarify.

Posted: 5/5/2021 2:23:29 PM

Answer:

McWhorter Ave shall receive Travel Lane Resurfacing Typical and Shoulder Resurfacing Typical in accordance with the Legend.

Status:

ANSWER PUBLISHED

Posted: 5/7/2021 9:04:40 AM

Question:

34100: Pay item no 548-50 (retaining wall system, special design) has very little information other than begin/end stations in the plans and TSP. It appears that this item has to be fully designed by the Contractor, submitted to and approved by the EOR/Department before

construction can begin. Is this correct?

Posted: 5/14/2021 11:52:29 AM

| Answer: | Correct. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
|-----------|---|---------|-----------------------|
| | | Posted: | 5/20/2021 9:55:45 AM |
| Question: | 34103: Retaining wall #3 support piles, pay item 455-35-8 only has a total quantity shown on sheet BQ-1. There are no given tip elevations for the H pile, total number of H pile, nor min/max embedment into the concrete cap. Please provide this information. | Posted: | 5/14/2021 12:50:48 PM |
| Answer: | Tip elevation of the Soldier Piles are defined with the dimension | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | measuring 32'-6" below reinforced concrete lagging (Typical Section, Sheet BW-6). Sheet No. Bw-4 shows 26 Soldier Piles. If all dimensions above the bottom of the concrete lagging are added, the minimum embedment length for the Soldier Piles is 35'-0". Embedment of the Soldier Piles in the pile cap is 1'-6". | Posted: | 5/20/2021 11:02:14 AM |
| Question: | 34104: Are there specific driving(impact, non-vibratory, press-in, etc) or bearing requirements for the H pile supports under Wall #3, Sta 719+43 - 720+95 Lt)? | Posted: | 5/14/2021 12:52:56 PM |
| Answer: | The driving criteria for the Soldier Piles is minimum embedment. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 5/20/2021 11:23:05 AM |
| Question: | 34105: Other than a proposed thickness of the panel, there are no construction details for the "Pre-cast Fascia Panels" shown attached to Wall #3. Can the Department provide this information or is this item to be completely designed/built by the Contractor? | Posted: | 5/14/2021 12:57:02 PM |
| Answer: | See Sheet BW-6 Note No. 1 | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 5/20/2021 11:25:15 AM |
| Question: | 34108: Retaining Wall #4 is detailed as a segmental block retaining wall system. The alignment of this wall is given as the top of coping. It appears as though this wall is on the ROW line and these block wall systems are not vertical, usually having between 2 and degree batter inward. Will the given offset allow placement of the footer within the current ROW or can it be moved in to accommodate? | Posted: | 5/14/2021 1:45:42 PM |
| Answer: | The wall was placed within the ROW and allows for the batter inward and the footer. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |
| | | Posted: | 5/20/2021 11:53:30 AM |

| Question: | 34124: The bid quantity for Pay item 0110-4-10, Removal of Existing Concrete, has a bid quantity of 5,489 SY however, the summary of quantities only list a total of 3,558 SY. Please clarity. | Posted: | 5/14/2021 2:51:34 PM |
|-----------|--|---------|--|
| Answer: | The summary of quantities in the roadway plans accounts for 3,558 SY and the remaining 1,931 SY under FPID 443672-1 is on the Summary of Structure Quantities in the structures plan set. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED 5/20/2021 11:56:34 AM |
| Question: | 34197: Traffic Control Note #7 states "No two consecutive median openings shall be closed for any construction operations." Please clarify if this is intended for the construction operations within the crossover or if this also pertains to mainline milling and resurfacing operations? | Posted: | 5/18/2021 10:42:58 AM |
| Answer: | The note pertains to construction within a particular median opening on the mainline. Should one median opening be closed, traffic can be re-routed to the next median opening and make a U-turn. | Status: | ANSWER PUBLISHED |