

Pre-bid questions and answers for:

FPN: 258415 -1-52-01

Contract #: T7209

Let Date: 9/16/09

Below are the pre-bid questions and answers. We appreciate your patience and look forward to your favorable bids.

Submitted: 6/16/09:

- 1) Would it be possible to receive Addendum #1 revisions in a PDF format?

Response: (7/20/09) Addendum #1 will be available in a *.pdf format.

- 2) The advertisement for this project provided values for the Bid Bond and Payment and Performance bonds. Will these requirements be incorporated in to the Project Specifications?

Response: 06/25/09: Only section 3-5.1 will be modified to match the surety bond amount of \$250,000,000 stated in the advertisement.

- 3) The advertisement for this project included Special Provisions as to Method of Compensation. Will these Special Provisions be incorporated in to the Specifications for this project?

Response: 06/25/09: The Special Provisions as to Method of Compensation will not be added to the Specifications. They will only remain in the Build-Finance Request for Proposals.

- 4) We could not find the Utility Schedules for this project on the FDOT website. Will this information be made available?

Response: 6/19/09: Yes, the utility relocation schedules have been made available via the following FDOT FTP site.
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/permitsandorutilityworkschedules/>

- 5) Special Provision 5-9.1 includes requirements for the Contractor to provide 2 utility boats for the duration of the Contract. Where will these boats be used?

Response: 6/19/09: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Special Provision 5-9.1 was included in the Specification Package in error. This specification will be removed from the Specification Package when the Supplemental Specifications Package is submitted.

- 6) Will FDOT be posting the sign in sheets from the mandatory Pre-Bid meeting on the Business Administration website?

Response: 6/19/09: The proposal, spec and plan holders are listed on the following site, [under the Important Letting Documents tab. http://www.dot.state.fl.us/cc-admin/2009_Lettings/2009_letting9_16.shtm](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/cc-admin/2009_Lettings/2009_letting9_16.shtm)

Submitted 6/19/09:

- 7) Sheet B-21 for the South project of Alt AA4 shows Alternates A & B in the drilled shaft details. Alternate B allows a 6' - 11" lap of the rebar cage at ground level for abutment shafts. Sheet B-6 for the North Core Bridges shows a similar alternate. This alternate is not included with the drilled shaft details for either South project Alt AA3 (Sheet B-22) or the South Core Bridges (Sheet B-14). Can Alternate B (transition from shaft to column at existing ground line) be used at all end bent locations throughout the project?

Response: 6/25/09: Yes, Alternate B (transition from shaft to column at existing ground line) can be used at all end bent locations throughout the project. However, the quantity of drilled shaft will still be calculated from the bottom of shaft to the bottom of the end bent cap with no additional payment for the construction joint.

Submitted 6/23/09:

- 8) FDOT has not published the sign-in sheets from the pre-bid meeting. Can this information be made available? At the least we request the contact information for the Tampa Port Authority representative.

Response: 7/2/09: The pre-bid meeting sign-in sheets are available for download at the following URL: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/D7/d7bidquestions/258415-1-52-01/> If you are interested in leasing property at the Tampa Port Authority for this project the contact person is: James Renner 813-905-5154 jrenner@tampaport.com

- 9) This question relates to Bid Items for Core Bridge work. There are 9 Bid Items 0110 3 for Removal of Existing Structure. 8 of these 9 are for the South project. Please clarify how we identify which Bid Item goes with which Bridge removal? Similarly there are 4 Bid Items 0455 18 for Protection of Existing Structures on the South project. How do we identify which Bid Item goes with which Structure?

Response: (7/31/09) The description for these bid items will be amended in a forthcoming revision. The new description will indicate which pay item is associated with which structure.

Submitted 6/25/09:

10) Understanding that this project is not a of the "Design Build" variety, could an alternate still be proposed for Section 548 12 ? Our proposed retaining wall system is not a QPL item. However it has been introduced to the SMO and use of the system can be procured through use of a TSP. Our unit pricing is comparable to historical estimates and our preliminary modeling has shown time savings of up to 2/3 vs MSE and embankment style approaches. We are currently contacting prime contractors/proposal holders and need to verify the use of a TSP on this type of project. Further info is available upon request.

Response: (7/2/09) The contractor shall not base his bid on an alternate wall system which is not approved at time of letting.

Submitted 7/6/09:

11) Can you please provide information on train traffic on all tracks that we will be working next to or over on this project?

Response: (7/8/09) Based on information provided by CSX, their typical rail schedule should be the following: A-Line: east/west route just south of 7th Ave.; has 4 Amtrak trains per day and up to 4 freight trains per day. SY-Line: north/south route goes under I-4; has 6 to 8 freight trains per day. S-Line (Hookers Point Spur into the Port of Tampa): east/west route that cross's SR 60; has 6 to 8 freight trains per day. Please use this information with the understanding that this information will change based on CSX's schedule. For the most recent rail traffic information please contact the CSX Roadmaster: Kenny Ford 5656 Adamo Dr. Tampa, Fl. 33619-3240 813)943-1578 kenny_ford@csx.com

Submitted: 7/10/09:

12) Please clarify what to include in bid item 0751 11 1 - Architectural -Special, Walls & Towers, as follows: Sections 2,3,4 & 5 - Alternates AA1 - AA4 Structures. There are 4 items with this bid item number, referring to the North project. Which bid item goes with which bridge? Section 20 - Architectural - What work is included in this bid item in this section? Sections 21, 22, 23 & 24 - Alternates AA1 - AA4 - Architectural. Do we assume that all Bridge Rustication for the south project is included in this bid item? (Note that Sections referenced are from the Advertisement for the project).

Response: (8/17/09) (A) For the North Project, Pier Rustication (Ybor City Treatment) is included in the Pay item 0751-11-1 Architectural Special, Walls & Towers. Bridge number associated with bid item 0751 11 1 - Architectural -Special, Walls & Towers for Section 2, 3, 4 & 5 are 100726, 100727, 100724 and 100729. This information is shown in the Partial Summary of Pay Items (Sheet B-6 for AA1 and B-5 for AA2 through AA4). The description for these bid items in the Bid Solicitation Notice and Approximate Quantity Tabulation will be amended in a forthcoming revision. The new description will indicate which pay item is associated with which structure. Please note that the cost of I-4 pier rustication is incidental to

the cost of pier concrete. We will add a note to the plans in the upcoming revision stating that the cost of "I-4 pier rustication" is incidental to the cost of class IV concrete (Mass) (Substructure). (B) For the work associated with Section 20 - Architectural, see Architectural plans, Core Plans 25841515201, sheets AG-0001 thru AL-3501 (C) No, since there are two different types of rustication not all rustication is included in this single pay item. Here is a summary of the South Project pier rustication payment information: Ybor City Pier Rustications for all appropriate bridges are covered under the Pay Item 0751-11-1 and are in TRNS*PORT Sections 21 through 24 as follows: 258415-1-52-01AA1 Architecture (0800) 0751-11-1 LS 1 (South Pier Treatments) 258415-1-52-01AA2 Architecture (0800) 0751-11-1 LS 1 (South Pier Treatments) 258415-1-52-01AA3 Architecture (0800) 0751-11-1 LS 1 (South Pier Treatments) 258415-1-52-01AA4 Architecture (0800) 0751-11-1 LS 1 (South Pier Treatments) All other integral pier rustications are incidental to the pier structure costs. We will add a note to the plans in the upcoming revision stating that the cost of column rustication for the Palmetto Beach Stripe is incidental to the cost of Class IV Concrete (Mass) (Substructure).

Submitted 7/20/09:

- 13) In addition to the LS pay items identified in a previous question there are several other LS pay items that cannot be associated with the structures they represent. Please identify which LS bid tabs are to be associated with which bridges. (ie segmental, bridge demo, protection of existing structure, structural steel, lighting inside box girders, architectural special - walls & towers).

Response: (7/31/09) The description for these bid items will be amended in a forthcoming revision. The new description will indicate which pay item is associated with which structure.

- 14) Where is the 11" Fiber Reinforced PCC Pavement located?

Response: 07/29/09: Per the CORE (258415-1-52-01) Architecture Component Set, Sheet AC-2106, the 11" VARIABLE Fiber Reinforced Concrete Pavement is utilized for the shoulders within the limits of the toll gantry (Sta. 10017+52.82 to Sta. 10018+54.75 CL Connector). Based on the roadway geometry, the pavement thickness will vary between 8" and 14" on the proposed shoulders.

- 15) The contract drawing on sheet B21-1 depict that the entire piles on Bridge # 100836 are to be removed, what are the length of these piles?

Response: (8/3/09) The bridge number provided in the question is the new bridge, #100836. The existing bridge number is 100451. The existing "GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION" sheet BX21-1 provides lengths for the End Bent and Pier test piles. The information provided should be used to estimate the amount of pile removal.

16) Roadway Sheet (10) and several other plan sheets show existing RR tracks to be removed. What is the schedule for their removal?

Response: (8/7/09) All existing railroad tracks labeled "to be removed" or "abandoned/to be abandoned" will be removed by others prior to construction.

17) Also on Roadway Sheet (10) and several other plan sheets, there are future RR tracks shown. What is the schedule to construct these new tracks?

Response: (8/7/09) The "future railroad tracks" as noted are for informational purposes only to insure the corridor is preserved for this purpose. CSX Transportation has not programmed construction of any of these future railroad tracks at this time.

18) Will the Department consider adding a bid item for finance charge? This way the finance would not have to be spread over the rest of the bid items and DBE/EEO Trainees would not have to be obtained for this portion of the bid.

Response: (7/20/09) The department has determined that including a bid item for finance costs would be inconsistent with the basis of contract award as stated in Article 3-2 of the 2007 Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, as amended for this project. However the DBE participation and the OJT will be based on the construction value and will not include the finance component. The construction value will be determined after contract award based on review of the bid and discussions with the contractor.

19) The contract drawings indicate that the existing bridge #105613 over the 34th street canal is to be removed. It appears there is no bid item for the removal of this bridge?

Response: (8/7/09) The description for these bid items will be amended in a forthcoming revision. The new description will indicate which pay item is associated with which structure. Bridge number #105613 has been added to the pay item description for one of the lump sum items 110-3 REMOVAL OF EXISTING STRUCTURE.

20) Are the plans available for the existing bridge #105613 over the 34th street canal, bridge? If so, would it be possible to obtain a copy?

Response: (8/7/09) There are existing bridge plans at the end of the plan set for each alternative. In the AA1 plans set (for example) see the Sheetndx.htm file. Under the structures category there are links to the PDFs for the existing bridges. See bottom link (in Sheetndx.htm) for Sheet No. BX14-1-14: EXISTING BRIDGE PLANS FOR BRIDGE 14. Sheets BX14-1 to BX14-14 are the available plans for existing bridge #105613.

21) Are the dates on the proposed payout actual dates or fiscal year dates?

Response: (7/23/09) Fiscal year dates. The fiscal year runs from July 1 through June Example - July 1 of fiscal year 2010 is July 1, 2009.

- 22) Alternate 2, Plan sheet B-17, General Note 5 (Alternate 4 similar). Note indicates that the balanced cantilever pier segments and the 4 segments up and down station to the pier segments to be Class VI concrete. Sheet No. B9-87, Note 3 states that all segments are Class V concrete. The summary of quantities for Bridge No. 100711 on Sheet No. B9-162 shows 693.29 CY of CL V concrete in the estimated quantities for expansion joint pier segments. Bridge 100711 encompasses 20 spans that are balanced cantilever segments. Are the balanced cantilever spans to be constructed with Class V or VI concrete?

Response: (7/31/09) 1. The Balanced cantilever pier segments and the four segments up and down station to the pier segments are to be constructed with Class VI Concrete. 2. There will be no change to the summary of quantities on B9-162. 3. Note 3 on B9-87 will be revised to the following: "Unless otherwise noted Segments are class V concrete. For location of class VI Segments see general notes." The note has been updated on the following sheets for both AA2 and AA4: B7-28, B8-19, B9-87 and B10-73. These changes will be included for the upcoming revision prior to the letting

- 23) All Alternates, Drainage Structures Sheet (1) - Note 3. Note indicates that special attention should be directed to the fact that portions of some drainage structures extend into the stabilized portion of the roadbed and that extreme caution is necessary in stabilization operations in this area. Please indicate which structures are affected by this note.

Response: (7/31/09) This note is a general cautionary note. It is the contractor's responsibility to identify any structures that may extend into the stabilization.

- 24) All Alternates, Drainage Structures Sheet (1) - Note 3. Note indicates that special attention should be directed to the fact that portions of some drainage structures extend into the stabilized portion of the roadbed and that extreme caution is necessary in stabilization operations in this area. Please indicate acceptance criteria for stabilization operations.

Response: (7/31/9) The acceptance criteria for stabilization operations are provided in the project specifications.

- 25) All Alternatives, Drainage Structures S-210, S-221, S-222, S-225, S210, S233, S303, S321, S314. Installation of these structures requires significant excavation within the 2:1 slope of the adjacent Expressway. Will the Department be providing details for Temporary Critical Walls in these areas?

Response: (8/10/09) Based on the construction phasing in the plans, temporary critical walls are not required in these areas; therefore the Department will not be

providing details for temporary critical walls. If the contractor changes the phasing or elects to work out of sequence then temporary critical walls may become necessary and the design and installation of the walls will be the Contractor's responsibility. Please note that drainage structure S-314 is not part of these contract plans.

- 26) In reference to the Toll Gantry Window Schedule sheet # AA-2602, window type E has a height of 7'-0" listed but the elevation shows it be 12'-8". Please clarify?

Response: (8/7/09) The height of 7'-0" shown in the table is incorrect. It has been corrected and will be included in an upcoming revision. The 12'-8" dimension is correct. Refer to sheets: AA-2127, AA-2213, AA-2215, AA-2312, AA-2602

- 27) The finish schedule indicates that Equipment Rooms 302 & 402 receive VCT flooring? However, we were unable to locate any floor finishes for the rooms in the equipment building. Please clarify if these are exposed concrete.

Response: (8/7/09) The floor finish for the equipment building is sealed concrete as indicated on AG-0015. The floor finish for rooms 302 and 402 is VCT as indicated on AG-0015.

- 28) In reference to sheet # AG-0015 Finish PT-9, the notes reference ALL gypsum board partition walls. As a clarification, is it the intent that all gypsum board partitions throughout the project receive this finish or just those in Rooms 302 & 402?

Response: (8/7/09) All gypsum board partition walls shall receive the paint color PT-9 as indicated on sheet AG-0015. In addition, the concrete walls and ceilings of rooms 302 and 402 shall receive PT-9 as indicated on sheet AG-0015.

- 29) Is there a ceiling in the equipment building or is this exposed truss?

Response: (8/7/09) Refer to drawings AA-2309, AA-2314, and AA-2315. There are no ceilings in the Equipment Building. All rooms are exposed to roof deck above with full height walls as shown.

- 30) Can you clarify the interior partition heights, for the different partition types, in the equipment building?

Response: (8/7/09) All partitions go to deck or structure above as noted in the drawings on sheets AG-0009, AA-2309, AA-2314, and AA-2315. The roof deck is the ceiling in the equipment building.

- 31) In reference to the FRP Panels; we have spoken with some of the manufactures of Fiber Glass and companies that build FRP Panels; however they are not familiar with this project or the design. Is there a contact person that was consulted during the design phase that we could contact?

Response: (8/7/09) The Department cannot provide this information. However we have researched this issue and know other contractors exist that can provide engineering and installation of this product locally.

- 32) Plan sheets B25-1, B25-2 & B25-6 show a 1' concrete lining in the 34th street canal. Please advise us which pay item covers this work?

Response: (8/7/09) The pay item for the 1' thick concrete lining is 0524 1 4. Please refer to the roadway pay items and summary of ditch pavement in the summary of quantities.

Submitted 7/22/09:

- 33) In Alternate AA4 South Project (Z movement is similar), General Bridge Plan note E on sheet B-17 states that 'all reinforcing steel shall conform to ASTM A615 Grade 60 (Grade 75 for drilled shafts only)'. Plan sheet B-22 Type C Alternate 2 shows the #20 Bars (??) to be grade 75. The similar note on sheet B-20 for Alternate AA3 states that 'all reinforcing steel shall conform to ASTM A615 Grade 60 unless noted otherwise'. Can you please confirm that all rebar for Alternate AA4 should be grade 60 unless noted otherwise.

Response: (8/7/09) You are correct, all rebar for Alternate AA4 should be grade 60 unless noted otherwise. As noted 75 KSI reinforcement will be required for Drilled Shaft Type C in Alternate AA4.

Submitted 7/23/09:

- 34) We would like to view the rock cores taken for this project. Can the FDOT make the cores available for viewing

Response: (8/3/09) The core samples will be available for viewing at the PSI Tampa Office located at 5801 Benjamin Center Drive, Suite 112, Tampa, FL 33634. Please contact Lloyd Lasher by August 7th at 813-886-1075 for an appointment.

Submitted: 7/24/09:

- 35) Erection of new bridges for this project will require working adjacent to MSE walls. What pressures have been assumed for equipment and superstructure elements on these MSE walls?

Response: (8/3/09) The design team has not assumed any construction loading on the MSE walls. See note 9 on sheet BW-6 for further information.

- 36) For all alternates, the plans detail different rustication details for the north project compared to the south and z movement project. Can the rustication details be

standardized for the entire project? Plan sheet examples: AA4 North Sheet B-304. South Sheet B-133, Z Sheet B-123.

Response: (8/17/09) No. The referenced details/ elements have been closely coordinated with local stakeholders and they must remain as shown in the plans.

- 37) For Alternates AA2 and AA4 sheet B-83, Note 4 on the right hand side states that the mix to be used to fill the recess for the transverse PT shall be approved by the Engineer prior to use. Will ready mix concrete of the same Class as the segment be allowed for filling these recesses?

Response: (8/7/09) Please refer to Transverse Deck Tendon Quantity/Stressing/Grouting/Anchor Protection Schedule for all segmental Bridges. For example, sheet B1-27 shows the anchor protection type for Up Station and Down Station as 9. As per Index 21802 Type 9, the recess for post tensioning requires MAPC (Magnesium Ammonium Phosphate Concrete. See specs section 930-5: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/specificationsoffice/Implemented/WorkBooks/JanWorkBook2009/Files/SS9300000.pdf> or Epoxy Grout.

Submitted 7/29/09:

- 38) Project # 258415-2, CORE, dwg B-1, upper left-hand corner notes, BX-Set (of drawings), existing Brdg I-4 over CSX, these drawings were not included with the Bid Set . Can the FDOT please provide these drawings?

Response: (8/7/09) The drawings BX-1 through BX-8 are available for download at the following URL: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/D7/d7bidquestions/258415-1-52-01/BX-Set%20from%20Core-Project.pdf>

- 39) Project # 258415-1, Core, drawings S119-S121 were not included in the bid set, can the FDOT please provide these drawings

Response: (8/10/09) These sheets will be provided in a forthcoming revision. In the interim these sheets are also available for download at the following URL: ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/D7/d7bidquestions/258415-1-52-01/S_Rev2.pdf

- 40) Project # 258415-2, AA4, sheet B-2 Index of sheets skips drawings B37-B100. Do these drawings exist? Or was it the intent to skip those numbers.

Response: (8/7/09) The drawing numbers B37-B100 were intentionally skipped.

- 41) The Specified Fixture for Bid Item # 715-11-126 on Project 258415-1-52-01 has been discontinued. The Specified Fixture for Bid Item # 715-11-126 on Project 258415-2-52-01 is no longer available with a Polycarbonate Lens. Please provide an alternate fixture specification.

Response: (8/17/09) The lighting plan notes for pay item #715-11-126 will be updated in a forth coming revision that will allow for an approved equal. The revision will also include a new fixture for under-deck lighting that specifies the use of a Minimate Luminaire 150 watts, photometric file GE176025, Acrylic refractor or approved equal.

- 42) To the extent the required bond amount is \$250 million, the second sentence of Section 3-5.4 of the Standard Specifications should be revised as follows: "It is expressly understood that the monetary limitation on the extent of the indemnification shall be the penal limit of the bond, which amount shall be \$250 million as may be increased by subsequent Supplemental Agreements."

Response: (8/03/09) The Department will be providing a clarification by Addendum addressing the fact that the surety's defense and indemnity obligations for this contract will be limited to the amount of \$250,000,000.

- 43) SS 9-5.4 and SS 9-10 address setoff. This is somewhat different than other specifications with project financing, for example design build finance specifications. We request two changes. First, delete the last paragraph of SS 9-5.4. Second, revise SS 9-10 to read as follows: "section 337.145 of the Florida Statutes, providing for offsetting payments to the Contractor is not applicable for this Contract"

Response: 8/21/09 The Department will not modify Article 9-5.4. However, this provision only applies to accounts for this Contract. The Department will revise Article 9-10 to read as follows: "Section 337.145 of the Florida Statutes, providing for offsetting payments to the Contractor, is not applicable for this Contract."

- 44) Will FDOT revise the formula used to determine the number of trainees required for the project given the size of the project? FDOT did make adjustments on the I-75 DBF project in District #1 and the I-595 P3 project in District #4.

Response: (8/3/09) The DBE participation and the OJT will be based on the construction value and will not include the finance component. The construction value will be determined after contract award based on review of the bid and discussions with the contractor.

- 45) The steel weights furnished are 2% to 17% lighter than actual weights. What methodology was used to calculate the weights?

Response: (8/7/09) Since this is a lump sum item (460-2), steel weights have not been furnished as part of the contract and the contractor is responsible for performing his own take-offs based on the contract plans.

- 46) Section 5-2 of the project specifications fails to reference the RFP Documents in the governing order of documents. Please advise its place in the governing order.

Response: (8/3/09) Article 5-2 of the 2007 Standard Specifications will be revised via an addendum issued prior to letting to provide for the governing order of documents as follows: 1. Build-Finance Request for Proposals. 2. Special Provisions. 3. Technical Special Provisions. 4. Plans. 5. Road Design, Structures, and Traffic Operations Standards. 6. Developmental Specifications. 7. Supplemental Specifications. 8. Standard Specifications.

- 47) Referencing Alternate AA4, bid item 3951, PIPE CULVERT,OPTIONAL MATERIAL,ROUND, 0-24"S/CD. The bid quantity is for 22,757 LF. The Summary of Drainage Structures sheets (sheet numbers 17 for the North project/ FPID 258415-2-52-01 and 120 for the South project/ FPID 258415-1-52-01) list 19,682 LF total for these items. This is similar for Alt AA2 as well. Please clarify.

Response: (8/10/09) For FPID 258415-1-52-01, the total quantity for PIPE CULVERT,OPTIONAL MATERIAL,ROUND, 0-24"S/CD is the sum of the quantities for RCPs (see summary of drainage structures), DIPs (see summary of drainage structures), PVC pipes (see Pier drainage details table), and yard drains (see summary of quantities / summary of yard drains). Please refer to the forthcoming revision* pay item footnotes for FPID 258415-1-52-01. *Earlier, even though yard drains were being included in the total quantity, the pay item footnotes did not reflect that. Therefore, the pay item footnotes have been revised for the forthcoming revision to include yard drains. For FPID 258415-2-52-01, the total quantity for PIPE CULVERT,OPTIONAL MATERIAL,ROUND, 0-24"S/CD is the sum of the quantities for RCPs and DIPs (see summary of drainage structures). The sum of the total quantities for FPID 258415-1-52-01 and FPID 258415-2-52-01 is equal to the total bid quantity for PIPE CULVERT,OPTIONAL MATERIAL,ROUND, 0-24"S/CD in all alternatives.

- 48) Referencing Alternate AA4, FPID 258415-1-52-01. The Summary of Drainage Structures sheet 29 (sheet no. 121) lists structures EX-80O and EX-80D, which appear to actually be pipe runs. This pipe is not shown on the Roadway Plan Sheets. This is similar for Alt AA2 too. Please clarify the work to be performed associated with these structures.

Response: (8/21/09) The work associated with EX-80O and EX-80D is to replace existing pipe runs that cross through the limits of construction for Piers 22-2, 22-3 and 20-3. Labels and description of this work will be reflected in the plan sheets and TCP sheets in the forthcoming revision.

Submitted August 4, 2009:

- 49) The project documents include a Technical Special Provision for road and bridge sweeping, roadside litter removal and edging and sweeping. This Technical Specification lists pay items where these activities will be paid that are not included in the existing bid items. Please clarify how this work will be paid.

Response: (8/10/09) Bid Items and Quantities will be added in a forthcoming revision for the following pay items: 906-110-1 Road and Bridge Sweeping - per mile 906-110-2 Roadside Litter Removal - per acre 906-110-3 Edging and Sweeping - Linear Feet

- 50) The project documents include a Technical Special Provision for Thermal Integrity Testing of Drilled Shafts. The specification indicates this testing will be performed on all non-redundant drilled shafts and other redundant drilled shafts selected by the Engineer. Thermal Integrity Testing is a relatively new method of testing and false readings can be produced. If the Engineer determines a drilled shaft is unacceptable based on the Thermal Integrity Testing, the contractor must core the shaft to allow further evaluation and repair or replace the shaft. If tests performed on the cores indicates that there are no problems with the drilled shaft, will the FDOT reimburse the contractor for delays and the cost of coring incurred?

Response: (8/31/09) The current Technical Special Provision for Thermal Integrity Testing will be replaced by a Developmental Specification in a forthcoming revision.

- 51) The RFP language was revised for Proposal No T7213 in Pinellas County as follows: The cash available for partial payments shown in the Cash Availability Schedules is subject to the availability of funds appropriated annually by the State Legislature and approved by the Governor. The Department shall include partial payments for this project in its tentative five year work program and legislative budget request prepared annually in accordance with Florida Statutes. If the total cash available for partial payments in the Cash Availability Schedules programmed and appropriated in any one fiscal year is not fully paid out during that fiscal year the Department shall include the fund balance in its certified forward request to the State Legislature in order to maintain the availability of those funds. The Department shall ensure that funds for partial payments shown in the Cash Availability Schedules are prioritized ahead of funding for new capacity projects in developing and updating its tentative work program, and that no more than 15% of the total amount of federal and state funds in any fiscal year are obligated for projects administered under Section 334.30, Florida Statutes. The Build-Finance Firm shall have the right to terminate the Contract in the event the Department fails to make a scheduled and due partial payment due solely to the lack of an annual appropriation to provide the funds shown in the Cash Availability Schedules. Will a similar change in the RFP be made for this project?

Response: (8/13/09) The RFP language regarding annual legislative appropriations, similar projects administered under Section 334.30, Florida Statutes, and the rights of Build-Finance Firms if the department does not make a partial payment due solely to the lack of an annual legislative appropriation for T7213 and T7209 are identical. The change was made to each RFP and they were posted on July 21, 2009. The current T7209 RFP can be obtained from the Department's Contract Administration website here: http://www.dot.state.fl.us/cc-admin/2009_Lettings/2009_BSN/Sep09/T7209.pdf

52) If FDOT terminates the contract for convenience, will FDOT pay the additional finance costs associated with such an action?

Response: Response: (8/21/09) In the event that the Department terminates the contract for convenience, payments to the Build-Finance firm will be governed by Article 8-9.2

Submitted 08/07/09:

53) Please clarify if the colored MSE panels are to have a consistent shade. It has been our experience (For example: I-95 / West Palm Beach Airport project) that the use of colored concrete panels results in several different shades. This is due in large part to the fly ash required in the FDOT mix design; no batch is ever exactly the same. If the intent is to have a consistent panel color, is it possible to provide a standard concrete panel and then come back afterwards and paint the panel the desired color and shade?

Response: (9/9/09) The concrete in the MSE panels is not colored. Concrete stain colors for the MSE wall panels are specified in the Technical Special Provision for Concrete Stain/Sealer.

Submitted: 08/09/09:

54) We have noticed a discrepancy in the post tensioning bid items for AA3. There are two AA3 post tensioning bid items: 41480 PT Superstr 39109 lbs, 41500 PT Substr 26240 lbs. In looking through the plans, we only see substructure PT (shts B3-27 & B3-35), which add up to 39109 lbs. The "Summary of Pay Items" sheet B-14 only lists a PT Superstructure item, with a quantity of 39109 lbs. No substructure PT quantity is given. It seems that this item should be substructure PT at 39109 lbs, and that there should be no superstructure PT at all.

Response: (8/31/09) These post tensioning quantities for alternative AA3 will be corrected in a forthcoming revision.

55) What happens if FDOT delays the project and there are costs associated with the delay? How will the GC be compensated for these increased costs and financing costs?

Response: (8/21/09) Please refer to Article 5-12.6.2.

56) How will S.A.'s, extra work and change orders be treated?

Response: (8/21/09) The timing of payment will be determined by the Department at the time of any contract changes.

57) In the specifications under SETTLEMENT MONITORING, 141-3 INSTALLATION, Paragraph K., it states that settlement has to be sufficiently

complete before the installation of the permanent concrete fascia panel at Wall W20. Is the assumption that Wall W20 is to be constructed of temporary wire wall, allowed to settle for (4) months, then the MSE panels are to be installed correct? If so, there is no detail of the MSE connection in the plans. Will the DOT provide this detail before bid?

Response: (9/10/09) The first stage consists of a permanent wire-faced wall. For the determination of when settlement is sufficiently complete for the installation of the permanent concrete fascia panels, see the Technical Special Provision. All details required for the two-staged MSE wall construction are to be submitted by the contractor for review and approval as part of the shop drawings. FDOT will not provide these details. The Technical Special Provision and plan sheets BW-7 and BW-55 will be revised in order to clarify these requirements.

58) All alternates - Bid items 1650, 2325, 3000, 3672. Please provide location for the sediment basin represented by this bid item. Standard Index 101 indicates dimensions to be provided in plans.

Response: (9/9/09) The sediment basin sizes and locations are highly dependent on the specific areas the contractor elects to drain to them at each construction phase, it will be the contractor's responsibility to locate and dimension these. The sediment basins will be constructed per index 101 (Type B) and will need to be capable of handling an anticipated sedimentation volume of at least 0.6 ac-ft.

59) Alternates 1 & 3. Please clarify the scope associated with Temporary Detour bid items 1593 and 2943. According to the pay item notes on sheet 72 this is the same scope that is covered by bid tabs 1587 and 2937 - however the quantities have changed.

Response: (9/1/09) It is our understanding that the intent of the question was to confirm that there was a third detour in the AA1 and AA3 alternatives only. It is correct that there are two project detours in the AA2 and AA4 alternatives and three project detours for the AA1 and AA3 alternatives. South Project Detour 2 (Bid Items 1593 and 2943 under FPID 25841515201) is used in Phase 4, Stage 1 for alternatives AA1 and AA3 (BL WB-DIV2). The scope for that work is defined under the Pay Item Footnote (Sheet 72 or 76) for PIN 102-2-2 and is as shown in the Traffic Control Plan Sheets for Phase 4, Stage 1. The quantities shown in the Pay Item Footnotes are the same in both AA1 and AA3 alternatives.

60) The wire walls west of 26th St. TMSE1 (STA 1671+65 to 1672+17) and TMSE2 (STA 2671+95 to 2672+46.72) show the bottom of excavation at an Elev. 6.0' (AA1/BW-102; AA2/BW-106; AA3/BW-102; AA4/BW-106). Is it necessary to excavate to Elev. 6.0' and not to existing embankment elevation? If so, how will the traffic be directed during construction?

Response: (8/21/09) It is necessary to excavate to Elev. 6.0 in this area in order to construct permanent MSE wall W6. For the description of how traffic will be directed during construction in this area, see the Traffic Control Plans.

- 61) TMSE-2 is about 38 ft parallel to Wall 5 as shown in the plan view of Critical Temporary Sheet Pile (AA1/BW-94; AA2/BW-98; AA3/BW-94; AA4/BW-98). How will this affect the installation of the soil anchors of Wall 5 (from STA 2671+95 to 2672+10) without damaging the wire wall?

Response: (8/21/09) The shop drawings submitted by the contractor for wall TMSE-2 shall include details of the placement of the soil reinforcement necessary to avoid the Wall W5 soil anchors.

- 62) Bid item 120-72 Gravel Fill has two items 440 CY and 5,267 CY, what work is to be included in these bid items?

Response: (8/21/09) These quantities are for the gravel fill (granular fill per standard index) underneath the 4" conc. cap between barrier walls at the Toll Gantry and along S.R. 618. Please see the typical sections sheets 9, 12, & 13 and concrete slope grading plans (1-6).

- 63) The Contract documents enable FDOT to direct changes to the original scope of work which could increase the Contract Price. It is not clear from the Contract documents how FDOT will compensate the Build Finance team for extra work directed. The Contract documents include a Cash Availability Schedule based upon funding as originally programmed, without consideration of payments for extra work. Please confirm that the extra work directed by FDOT to the Build Finance team will not require financing by the Build Finance Team.

Response: (8/21/09) The timing of payment will be determined by the Department at the time of any contract changes.

- 64) The Contract documents do not address how FDOT caused delays or delays beyond the control of the Build Finance team will be compensated. The Contract documents include a Cash Availability Schedule based upon funding as originally programmed, without consideration of payments for delays. Please provide an explanation of how the Build Finance team will be compensated for delays, including compensation of the debt financing.

Response: (8/21/09) Please refer to Article 5-12.6.2.

- 65) There is a risk of changes in interest rates in the period of time between bid submission and financial close. Is FDOT willing to consider a bid price adjustment mechanism between bid submission and financial close to adjust for financing cost

changes, including changes in the benchmark interest rate and credit spread, similar to what was employed in the recent I-595 procurement?

Response: (8/21/09) The Department is not willing to consider an interest adjustment mechanism for this Contract.

- 66) Given the expense of arranging and holding in place financing commitments for several months, will FDOT accept a preliminary Letter of Commitment for anticipated debt financing without firm, committed financing in place at the time of bid and with FDOT being responsible for market fluctuations between the time of the bid submission and contract award/financial close?

Response: (8/21/09) No.

- 67) The RFP provides that the Build Finance firm shall have the right to terminate the Contract in the event FDOT fails to make a scheduled and due partial payment in accordance with the Cash Availability Schedule due to a lack of funding. In addition to the right to terminate, what remedies can FDOT offer the Build Finance team if there is a failure to appropriate or a delay in appropriation of necessary funds in accordance with the Cash Availability Schedule based upon funding as originally planned?

Response: (8/21/09) The Florida Statutes govern the annual legislative appropriation process that provides the Department with the authority and funds to expend each fiscal year. The Department's Comptroller approves binding commitments of funds for each contract "locking down" future year funding in the work program. As provided in the Build-Finance Request for Proposals revised July 21, 2009, the Department shall ensure that funds for partial payments shown in the Cash Availability Schedules are prioritized ahead of funding for new capacity projects in developing and updating its tentative work program.

- 68) In the event the project is only partially complete, due to no fault of the Build Finance team, how will debt be paid by FDOT to the Build Finance team?

Response: (8/21/09) The Build-Finance Request for Proposals in Subarticle 9-5.1 addresses partial payments by the Department and Article 8-9.2 addresses termination of the Contract for the convenience of the Department.

Submitted 08/18/09:

- 69) Prior to executing the Contract, please confirm that the Contractor will be provided a copy of the "statement" required under F.S.A. §339.135(a) (providing that the FDOT is to "require a statement from the comptroller of the department that funds are available prior to entering into any such contract or other binding commitment of funds.")

Response: (8/31/09) The Department will only award a contract if funds for the contract have been encumbered.

70) Please confirm that the FDOT can direct a change in the scope of the work for the Project (after execution of the Contract) thereby increasing the Contract Price to an amount that exceeds the 5-year work plan funding without first increasing the amount then set forth in the 5-year work plan to include the costs related to such change?

Response: (8/31/09) The funds must be programmed prior to adding scope that increases the cost. Yes, the funds may be outside the 5 year adopted work program, but they must be programmed.

71) The Project Contract Documents contemplate that the FDOT has the ability to direct changes in the original scope of work which could increase the Contract Price and/or compensate the Contractor for certain delays. The RFP sets forth the provisions relating to payments to the Contractor and, in particular, contains a Cash Availability Schedule. However, it is not clear from the applicable RFP sections (or other sections in the Contract Documents) how the FDOT will compensate the Contractor for any changed work that increases the Contract Price and/or for compensable delays. Please explain

Response: (8/31/09) The timing of payment will be determined by the Department at the time of any contract changes.

72) If cash becomes available in a specific quarter pursuant to the Cash Availability Schedule, but is not paid out to Contractor in such quarter, please confirm the unused amount is available for payment to the Contractor for work completed in the next succeeding quarters

Response: (8/31/09) Confirmed.

73) Section 9-5.1 of the RFP provides: "The invoice amount shall be a summation of the contract pay item quantities performed over the invoice period multiplied by the corresponding contract pay item unit prices; up to, but not exceeding, the cash available per the appropriate Cash Availability Schedule". Please clarify that the Contractor can invoice the FDOT for work performed each month, even if such work exceeds the amount of cash available for such period?

Response: (8/31/09) No. The RFP clarifies on page 5 that the invoice amount shall be a summation of the contract pay item quantities performed over the invoice period multiplied by the corresponding contract pay item unit prices; up to, but not exceeding, the cash available per the appropriate Cash Availability Schedule

74) What written documentation will the FDOT provide to the Contractor each month after the work has been performed and approved by the FDOT, but not yet paid for because funds are not yet available pursuant to the Cash Availability Schedule?

Response: (8/31/09) No additional documentation will be provided by the Department. Per Section 9-5.1, the Department will provide monthly estimates based on the amount of work that the Contractor completes during the month. These estimates will contain a detailed listing of contract pay items.

75) Will the Contractor be required to re-invoice work performed and approved by the FDOT, but not yet paid for because funds are not yet available pursuant to the Cash Availability Schedule?

Response: (8/31/09) Yes. The RFP states on page 5, "Any reduction in payment due to insufficient cash available shall be included on the next monthly invoice."

76) To the extent instructed to do so by Contractor, would the FDOT pay a third-party lender directly instead of the Contractor?

Response: (8/31/09) No. As provided by the RFP, payment will be made to the Contractor by warrant mailed to the Project Specific Escrow Account.

77) In the event the anticipated Notice to Proceed is delayed, will the FDOT provide an approved method to allow the Contractor to adjust its Price Proposal (up or down) to reflect changes in interest rates?

Response: (8/31/09) The Department is not willing to consider an interest adjustment mechanism for this Contract.

78) Will the FDOT provide written opinion from the Florida Attorney General an opinion stating that the Contract entered into by the FDOT and the successful bidder is enforceable under the Florida Constitution and F.S.A. 334.30?

Response: (8/31/09) No.

79) The D-B-F specifications (from other FDOT procurements) provide that the FDOT will not withhold any further funds after Final Completion/Final Acceptance. That language is not included in the Project Contract Documents. In the second paragraph, after the 1st sentence of Section 9-8.1 of the RFP, we suggest inserting the following new sentence: "At that time, no additional reductions will be made."

Response: (8/31/09) The requirements of Supplemental Specification Article 9-8 are correctly stated in the RFP and the Contract Documents.

80) There is a 3 year "value added" asphalt pavement warranty. There is also a 5 year warranty for "galvanized steel strain poles, galvanized steel mast arm(s), and galvanized steel monotube assemblies". Please clarify any further/additional Contractor warranties for the Project.

Response: (8/31/09) All Contractor Warranties are included in the Contract Documents.

81) Will the FDOT enter into a contract with a special purpose entity?

Response: (8/31/09) A Joint Venture that complies with the Contract Documents is eligible to bid on this project.

82) Will the FDOT provide the Contractor with a promissory note identifying how much is outstanding for work performed, but not yet paid?

Response: (8/31/09) No.

83) In reference to Sheet B 132 for bridges 100694, 100711, etc "Diaphragm Opening Screening Details", can the Department provide further guidance as to where these screens are located. Are they located at every expansion joint location?

Response: (8/21/09) Yes, at every expansion joint location.

84) FDOT made the following change to previous BF & DBF projects and request the same change be made to this project. DEVELOPMENTAL SPECIFICATIONS PARTIAL PAYMENTS, BUILD - FINANCE CONTRACTS. (REV 3-24-09), pages 53 - 58 is deleted. OFFSETTING PAYMENTS, BUILD - FINANCE CONTRACTS. (REV 5-19-09) ARTICLE 9-10 (Pages 103 and 104) is deleted and the following substituted: 9-10 Offsetting Payments. Section 337.145 of the Florida Statutes, providing for offsetting payments to the Contractor, is not applicable for this Contract.

Response: (8/31/09) The Department will revise Article 9-10 to read as follows; "Section 337.145 of the Florida Statutes, providing for offsetting payments to the Contractor, is not applicable for this Contract."

85) There is an existing sinkhole adjacent to stn. 528 for Ramp K over CSX and SR60. There is evidence of artesian flow at this location. The sinkhole does not show on the cross sections, but there is a need to utilize this area for access and for locating cranes during the erection of structures. Please clarify that this sinkhole is backfilled and who is responsible for plugging the artesian flow.

Response: (9/9/09) This area is identified on roadway plan sheet 7. This is also shown on drainage structure section at Sta. 685+82.18. The use of the area by the contractor is at his option. Any work effort needed to utilize and restore this area is incidental to the work being performed.

86) Pay Item 400-2-10 - Concrete Class II Approach Slabs, appears in the roadway plans for all options and appears to be for the approach slabs located at the Toll Gantry. The

quantity for AA1 and AA3 is 477.9 cy, while the quantity for AA2 and AA4 is 477.9 cy. Is this difference correct? If so, what is the difference between the alternates?

Response: (9/1/09) The question should have noted that the AA1 and AA3 quantities are 477.9 CY and the AA2 and AA4 quantities are 607.2 CY. The difference is correct. The size of the approach slab is different due to the different type of expansion joints used at the end of the bridges coming into the approach slab.

87) We request a postponement to the bid date for this project. This postponement is to allow teams to finalize the inter-party agreements for the financing package required for this project. The amount of financing required for this project makes the finance package for this project unique or more like a P3 procurement. While we are requesting a postponement to the bid date, we fully understand the importance of starting this work as soon as possible. Therefore we suggest that a corresponding reduction in time between the bid date and date for execution of the contract be enacted, so there is a net zero change to the project schedule. So we propose the following new dates: Bid Date October 14, 2009, Posting Date November 13, 2009, Anticipated Award Date November 20, 2009, and Contract Execution by December 22, 2009.

Response: (8/31/09) The Department will revise Article 9-10 to read as follows; "Section 337.145 of the Florida Statutes, providing for offsetting payments to the Contractor, is not applicable for this Contract."

88) Please confirm that the balanced cantilever segmental plans are based on the fact that the Engineer has determined all of the segments can be erected with conventional crawler, hydraulic and / or truck cranes, while maintaining traffic.

Response: (9/1/09) Refer to erection and construction notes in the plans. For project 258415-1-52-01, see sheet B-109, Note 1. For project 258415-2-52-01, see sheet B3-5, construction notes.

89) Will the DRC be responsible for handling all contaminated water from onsite dewatering operations? If so, how many gallons per day will the will the DRC be capable of handling? And how will the DRC handle this contaminated water from the Contractor's dewatering operations?

Response: (8/31/09) Response: 1. The DRC will be responsible for treating and discharging contaminated water from the Contractor's onsite dewatering operations but only from those sites determined to have groundwater contamination. 2. The DRC's discharge locations and maximum flow rates are regulated by the City of Tampa discharge permits issued to the DRC and have been included in the bid package. 3. Contaminated water will be handled by the DRC in accordance with the contract documents.

90) Will the DRC replace any and all contaminated material that is removed from the site? Is there any area that will not be replaced? Pond excavation? Drill Shaft excavation? Storm drainage pipe excavation? Utility excavation?

Response: (8/31/09) Yes, the DRC will provide replacement material.

91) Plan note 5 on sheet 4, Alternate AA3 indicates that the 'DRC contractor will provide backfill for all areas for contaminated soils removal or will backfill and compact areas of contaminated soils at the discretion of the Engineer'. Under what circumstances will the Engineer authorized the DRC contractor to perform backfill and compaction operations? Is it the intent of the Department for the general contractor to exclude all backfill and compaction cost in the parcels indicated in the plans?

Response: (8/31/09) It is not anticipated that the Engineer will authorize the DRC contractor to perform backfill and compaction operations. The contractor's bid shall include costs for backfill and compaction operations.

92) The plan notes on sheet B-20 (Alternate AA2) indicate that the segmental boxes shall receive class 5 finish. The Technical Special Provisions for Concrete Stain and Sealer page 6 of 11 (second cell down from the top of the table) indicates that the boxes will be coated with stain & sealer. Please confirm which coating system is required on the segmental boxes.

Response: (8/21/09) The Class V finish, as called out on the plans, is required for all superstructure for segmental construction.

93) Will the Department compensate the Contractor for remediation work performed by a remediation Contractor procured by the General Contractor? If so, at what rate? And will the Department remain the generator?

Response: (8/31/09) All remediation work will be performed by the DRC.

94) The quantities include multiple LS items for Protection of Existing Structures. In some instances, specific structures are identified for protection in the quantity backups - but not always. I have also not been able to find much guidance in the drawings. Anyway, the number and location of structures to be protected determines how much effort is required for daily settlement monitoring during pile driving and drilled shaft installation. So here are my questions for FDOT.

Response: (9/9/09) See next question for response.

95) In regards to the various Lump Sum Bid Items for Protection of Existing Structures, please provide the following. a. Bridge 1 #100724 - Please confirm the relevant structures for Options AA1, AA2, AA3, and AA4 are 2810 East 5th Avenue and 2900 East 7th Avenue. b. Bridge 3 #100722 - Please confirm the relevant structure is 2810

East 5th Avenue. c. Bridge 7 #100694 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). d. Bridge 9 #100711 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). e. Bridge 10 #100719 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). f. Bridge 13 #100723 - Please confirm the relevant structure is 3101 East 3rd Avenue and/or identify the relevant structure at "Unit 13-1". g. Bridge 16 #100721 - Please confirm the relevant structure is 3101 East 2nd Avenue. (Is the repeated 3101 house number a coincidence?) h. Bridge 18 #100834 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). i. Bridge 19 #100835 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). j. Bridge 20 #100443 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). k. Bridge 22 #100444 - Please confirm the relevant structures are the "Reversible Lane Bridge Piers" and identify the specific piers. l. Ramp B #100730 - Please identify the relevant structure(s). m. Ramp C #100733 - Please identify the relevant structure(s).

Response: (9/9/09) Regarding Protection of Existing Structures, as a minimum, the relevant structures in the South section (258415-1-52-01 and 258415-3-52-01) are listed on Sheets: 258415-1 AA1 - B-21 258415-1 AA2 - B-19 258415-1 AA3 - B-21 & B-202 258415-1 AA4 - B-19 & B-202 258415-3 AA1 - B-13 258415-3 AA2 - B-13 258415-3 AA3 - B-13 258415-3 AA4 - B-13 However, the listing provided on the above sheets should not be considered to include all of the properties/structures to be addressed by FDOT Specification Section 455-1.1. In the North section (258415-2-52-01), all relevant structures fall within the parameters outlined in FDOT Specification Section 455-1.1.

Submitted: 08/19/09:

96) How will the Department compensate the Contractor for the Port taxes and tariffs associated with moving construction materials in and out of the proposed Port casting yard facility?

Response: (9/2/09) The Department is not a party to the agreement with the Port for the use of their property. The contractor is responsible for any terms based on their lease with the Port for the use of property.

97) Regarding the temporary lighting: Is the catalog number HFR-150 (or equal) the proper number for the 150 watt HPS temporary lights? What type pole is to be installed for temporary lighting?

Response: (9/11/09) The Temporary Lighting Sheet calls out for HFR-150 (or equal) type lights. The catalog number for the temporary lighting poles is Lithonia Lighting HFR-150S-TA or approved equal. Per the temporary lighting plan notes, the contractor may substitute the following design, with his own design signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Florida, at his own cost, and upon approval by the Engineer. 2 ½" Schedule 40 steel poles, attached to the temporary barrier wall with brackets have been used in similar projects.

98) Are the service control enclosures at load centers for lighting and ITS, Nema 3R or Nema 4X?

Response: (9/1/09) All load centers for lighting and ITS shall be NEMA 3R enclosures.

99) We are having trouble finding a specification on the RipRap Articulating Block bid item. We assume it is an armorflex type product, but can't find anything within the current specs, addenda or standard drawings. Please indicate where the specifications for this product can be found.

Response: (9/9/09) A Technical Special Provision for the RipRap Articulating Block bid item has been added in a forthcoming revision.

100) In the AA2 and AA4 plans, Sheet B7-7 shows a conflict between an existing Gravity Wall and a proposed Critical Temporary Sheet Pile Wall (TSW7-3) at Bridge 100694 Pier 3. Note 3 on Sheet B7-7 indicates "removal and repair of gravity wall shall be paid under Removal of Existing Structures". However, there is not a Removal of Existing Structures Bid Item associated with this bridge. The same conflict between the existing wall and the proposed footing will occur in AA1 and AA3, but is not explicitly identified. So, what exactly is required where the wall and footing conflict, and what is the basis for payment?

Response: (9/10/09) For AA1, AA2, AA3 and AA4 - The cost for the removal of the portion of existing concrete barrier walls and concrete cap in conflict with the Pier 10-10 footing shall be considered incidental to the Class IV Concrete (Mass Substructure) of the pier footing. Refer to the roadway plans for replacement details of concrete cap, barrier wall, pavement and other roadway related items required for the construction of Pier 10 - 10 footing. For AA1 and AA3 - The portion of the existing gravity wall that conflicts with the footing construction shall be removed and replaced per the current Gravity Wall Index 520. The cost for the removal and replacement of the portion of gravity wall in conflict with the pier footing shall be considered incidental to the Class IV Concrete (Mass Substructure) of the pier footing. For AA2 and AA4 - The cost will be incidental of the removal of existing structure for bridge #100718

101) Are we to assume under Section 20, the item Architect - Special, Walls & Towers 25841515201 refers to the architectural precast panels located at the Gateway and Toll Gantry? Therefore implying that just the architectural panels for the Gateway and Toll Gantry should be included in bid item 0751-11-1 and the rest of the items at the Gateway and Gantry are to be included in either bid item 0735-74 or 0750-1-19.

Response: (9/2/09) No, please refer to the Architectural Plans under 258415-1-52-01 CORE, Sheets AG-0010 to AG-0013 and Sheet AL-3501.

102) Will CSX require cranes capacity to be reduced by 50% for lifts over the railroad and will this apply to the overhead erection gantry?

Response: (9/2/09) The Lifting Equipment Capacity around CSXT Facilities is described in the following locations in the plans: 1. For AA1 see FPID 258415-1-52-01, Sheet 5, Lifting Equipment note 1. These notes apply to 258415-1-52-01, 258415-2-52-01 and 258415-3-52-01 as indicated on sheet 3. 2. For AA2 see FPID 258415-1-52-01, Sheet 5, Lifting Equipment note 1. These notes apply to 258415-1-52-01, 258415-2-52-01 and 258415-3-52-01 as indicated on sheet 3. 3. For AA3 see FPID 258415-1-52-01, Sheet 5, Lifting Equipment note 1. These notes apply to 258415-1-52-01, 258415-2-52-01 and 258415-3-52-01 as indicated on sheet 3. 4. For AA4 see FPID 258415-1-52-01, Sheet 5, Lifting Equipment note 1. These notes apply to 258415-1-52-01, 258415-2-52-01 and 258415-3-52-01 as indicated on sheet 3.

Submitted 08/20/09:

103) 1. Concerning Sheet S-85 Lighted Cantilever Structure 10S685, we cannot a pay item for this structure, please advise. 2. Details are given for both Radius and Mitered Upright Monotube supports, see sheet S-93, S-94, S-95 and S-96 and also S-98 & S-99. Will Mitered Upright Support columns be allowed? If so will special welding qualifications be required for this type of joint?

Response: (9/2/09) 1. The pay item is shown on sheet S-46. 2. Mitered upright support columns will be allowed at the locations shown in the plans (refer to FDOT Structures Design Manual Volume 9, Section 5.15.1), and special welding qualifications will not be required for this type of joint.

Submitted 08/24/09:

104) Past Monotube Sign Structures in District 7 have been painted RAL 1013 & 1019 Glossy 90%. I notice on these structures you specify some items as RAL 1013 & 1019 Satin Finish. Is this correct? If so, what percentage of gloss do you want the satin to be?

Response: (9/10/09) Follow Federal Standard 595B.

Submitted 08/26/09:

105) This project calls out the use of 30" dia. x 1.000" Wall Pipe. This pipe cannot be purchased in the US. What is an allowable substitute for this. See below for another possible substitute. We can offer the following on the 30" x 1.000" wall. This can be manufactured using ASTM-A572 GRADE 50 100% M&M PLATE. We can choose plate that has a minimum yield strength of 52ksi to meet the DOT X52 requirement. This can be produced in 10'-0" lengths. Each will have one longitudinal weld seam. 100 % penetration and verified using X-ray. 10' lengths can be spliced longitudinally

using the same method, i.e. 100% penetration welds and verified using x-ray. Please advise if this is an acceptable offering.

Response: (9/9/09) This pipe is available domestically, either as a stock item or special ordered item.

Submitted 09/02/09:

106) There is a discrepancy in the concrete callout for the straddle bent integral pier cap for Pier CD2 for 258415-2-52-01-AA1. The callout on Sheet B8-20 , Pier CD2 is Class IV concrete (Flowing)(Mass)(superstructure), but according to general notes (B-7) and estimated pier quantity tables the concrete for integral pier caps for both Pier CD2 and B3 should be Class IV concrete cast-in-place (Flowing)(Mass)(substructure). Please clarify.

Response: (9/2/09) For AA1 North structures (258415-2-52-01-AA1), the term "superstructure" is incorrect in the callout for integral straddle bent concrete in the Pier CD2 elevation view, on Sheet B8-20. Integral pier cap concrete for both Piers CD2 and B3 should be Class IV concrete cast-in-place (Flowing)(Mass)(substructure) in accordance with the general notes (Sheet B-7).

107) Can you confirm if the buildings noted in pay item footnote for 110-3 have been removed?

Response: (9/2/09) The buildings noted in pay item footnote: 110-3 Includes the removal of the following buildings at 507 N. 22nd Street on FDOT right of way parcel number 120: Masonry building - 6,550 SF, Masonry building - 2,048 SF, Steel/Metal building - 9,644 SF, if necessary. If the buildings are removed by others, no payment will be made for this work. The contractor shall provide 14 days written notice to the Department Environmental Management Office before beginning demolition of these structures. The contractor will be responsible for obtaining necessary permits and any other local agency requirements for structure demolition including the NESHAP requirements in accordance with the General Notes and Specifications. have been removed by the department and shall not be included in the contractor's bid.

108) The response to the previously submitted question - "1. Concerning Sheet S-85 Lighted Cantilever Structure 10S685, we cannot a pay item for this structure, please advise. 2. Details are given for both Radius and Mitered Upright Monotube supports, see sheet S-93, S-94, S-95 and S-96 and also S-98 & S-99. Will Mitered Upright Support columns be allowed? If so will special welding qualifications be required for this type of joint?" is incorrect. The correct answer is posted in the response to this question.

Response: (9/2/09) 1. The pay item is shown on sheet S-46. 2. Refer to FDOT Structures Design Manual Volume 9, Section 5.15.1. Also, refer to AWS for welding.

Submitted 09/03/09:

109) We are looking for a copy of the Agreement (boilerplate contract) that would be signed if we were to win the Crosstown job. Could you please provide an electronic copy or a link for this document? Thanks

Response: (9/3/09) The contractor can view the contract package that has been developed as a form. It is Form No. 375-020-44. The form can be downloaded from the following web site: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/proceduraldocuments/> Click on "FORMS" and then the form number

110) Subject to responses to 2 questions in Section 9-5.1 of the RFP dated 8/31/09. Please clarify that the Contractor will receive monthly estimate documentation from FDOT confirming the quantities of work performed and accepted by the FDOT for that month, regardless of whether there is an invoice attached to that estimate.

Response: (9/11/09) The Contractor will receive monthly estimate documentation from FDOT confirming the quantities of work completed for that month.

111) What is to be included as part of bid item 400-147, composite neoprene pads? Specifically Bridge No. 100443 Pier 20-3 and 20-2, are the bearing manufactures to provide the sole plates, anchor bolts, couplers, and blockouts with grout tubes? If the bearing manufactures are to provide the couplers and blockouts could FDOT provide a material call out for these items? If we are to provide the sole plates, are the slopes running perpendicular to the bridge accounted for in beam or pedestal height? On sheet no. B20-123 can you elaborate on BEARING PAD NOTE 1 requiring all bearing pads to have a 50 durometer hardness? Does this durometer hardness apply to the circular bearings with a shear modulus of 150 psi?

Response: (9/14/09) a) Bid item 400-147, includes furnishing and installation of the composite neoprene pads as detailed in the plans. b) It is the prime contractor's responsibility to determine who provides these items. c) Please see b) above. The anchor bolts shall be in accordance with ASTM F1554 Grade 55 as specified in the General Notes. The sole plates shall be ASTM A709 Grade 50. d) Yes. The slopes have been accounted for in the pedestal elevations. e) Bearing Pad Note 1: All rectangular bearing pads shall have Grade 50 Durometer hardness and All circular bearing pads shall have Grade 60 Durometer hardness. f) No. Circular bearing pads shall have Grade 60 Durometer hardness. Please see FDOT specifications section 932-2.2.11.

Submitted 09/04/09:

112) In review of the contract documents concerning Signing and Pavement Markings, Pay Items No # 700-38-XXX and No# 700-39-XXX, paint over galvanized. Review of precedent documents have been completed and there is no reference to a five year warranty for Paint over galvanized for the Sign Structures. The value added warranty is referenced for Mast Arm Assemblies as per page no. 508 of the Specifications but no reference has been issued for the 700-Pay Items. After contacting numerous manufacturers approved by the Materials Office for " Coatings " we have been unable to locate an acceptable manufacturer in coatings to issue any type of warranty for any Paint over galvanized Sign Structure. The Departments direction is requested.

Response: (9/12/09) The structures associated with pay items Pay Items No # 700-38-XXX and No# 700-39-XXX (paint over galvanized), shall be painted in accordance with Section 649 - Galvanized Steel Strain Poles, Mast Arms and Monotube Assemblies. The Department has confirmed that there are suppliers capable of providing these structures that meet these requirements. Prequalified Fabricators of Painted Galvanized Steel Strain Poles, Steel Mast Arms & Monotube Assemblies are listed on the Department's webpage at the following URL:
<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/ContractorIssues/PaintedPole/PrequalifiedFabricators.shtm>

113) Plan Documents: Signing and Pavement Markings: Pay Items 700-20-11 through 700-20-XX Sign, Single Post. Will the Single Post Signs require the same painting requirements as stated for the Multipost Signs in the General Notes. The notes are encompassing back of sign panels, wind beams, hangers, etc. but no reference to Sign, Single Posts are referenced. Clarification requested.

Response: (9/14/09) Projects 258415-1 and 258415-2 require all signs (single column, multi column, and overhead) to be painted. This is done as continuity in aesthetic philosophy of DTI and I-4 3a/3b.

Submitted 09/07/09:

114) Can you clarify BEARING PAD NOTE 4 on sheet no. B1-54 in regards as to whether this note refers to Specification 932-2 of special / technical provisions, where there is no mention of Level II testing, or if it refers to the Specification 932-2 as found in the Florida Department of Transportation Standard Specifications?

Response: (9/10/09) The note is a reference to the FDOT Standard Specifications.

Submitted 09/08/09:

115) This question is in regards to the composite neoprene bearing pads for Sections 258415201 AA2 and 258415201 AA4, reference sheet no. B-97 of AA2 and AA4. The bearings have an internal detail with 1/16" steel reinforcements. Information received from our sheet metal vendors suggest that steel of this thickness is only provided in gage readings. Furthermore, Section 932-2.2.2, Materials, of the special / technical provisions require a minimum thickness for steel reinforcement of 0.1345" (10ga) material. What gage of material is to be substituted for the 1/16" steel plates?

Response: (9/14/09) 14 gage plates are acceptable for Sections 258415201 AA2 and 258415201 AA4.

Submitted 09/09/09:

116) The plans prohibit the use of stay-in-place forms on bridge numbers 100443, 100444, 100447, 100449, 109918, and 105612. As polymer coated s.i.p. forms are allowed in the new vehicular bridges, can they be used in bridge widenings and for the new path bridge? Past deck replacement projects have allowed stay-in-place forms with polystyrene filled flutes. Can this construction method, used in conjunction with polymer coatings, be utilized for the deck replacements? Thank you. Jonathan Causey Consolidated Systems, Inc.

Response: (9/14/09) The use of stay-in-place forms is prohibited.

117) Regarding Section AA1 and AA3: General notes state that governing specifications for this project are FDOT Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, 2007 Edition, as amended by contract documents. Contract documents for these sections state that coated metal forms shall be used due to the extremely aggressive environment. Is this statement in the contract documents at variance to FDOT Subarticle 400-5.7.1 as revised in 2009, or are the the requirements of this revision to be adhered to?

Response: (9/14/09) Polymer coated metal forms shall be used consistent with FDOT Specifications Article 400-5.7.1, as revised in 2009.

118) Per note 5 on sheet B-246 for Section AA2 and note 3 on sheet B-308 for Section AA3, bearings are to be in accordance with Standard Specification Sections 932-2. Can it be confirmed that the elastomeric bearings are to be fabricated and tested per the Florida Department of Transportation Standard Specifications Section 932-2?

Response: (9/14/09) The composite elastomeric bearings for Section AA3, FPID 258415-2 shall be fabricated and tested accordance with the Florida Department of Transportation Standard Specifications Section 932-2, and as modified by the contract plans. The composite elastomeric bearings for Section AA2, FPID 258415-2,

with the exception of pier F1 bearings, shall be fabricated and tested accordance with the Florida Department of Transportation Standard Specifications Section 932-2, and as modified by the contract plans. The composite elastomeric pads for Section AA2, FPID 258415-2 for pier F1 bearings shall be fabricated and tested accordance with FDOT Standard Specifications Section 932-2, and as modified by the contract plans. The sliding assembly (stainless steel plates, PTFE and top and bottom steel plates) for Section AA2, FPID 258415-2 for pier F1 bearings shall be fabricated accordance with per FDOT Standard Specifications Section 461, and as modified by the contract plans. The whole bearing assembly (composite neoprene pad and sliding assembly) for Pier F1 shall be tested accordance with FDOT Standard Specifications Section 461.

Submitted 09/10/09:

119) This is in reference to Section AA2. On bridge 100729 what is the grade of steel and coating to be used for the bearing assembly at Pier F1?

Response: (9/14/09) Sheet B-246, Note 5 refers to 461 Standard Specification that specifies the material and coating for the Pier F1 assembly.

120) In the General notes on the signing portion 258415-1 only, note 4 reads type IX reflective sheeting to be used on all signs. use Diamond Grade DG3 or approved equal. 3M DG3 has a ASTM rating of type XI, should all signs have type IX or type XI?

Response: (9/14/09) For 258425-1, per the plans and Turnpike Plans Preparation and Practices Handbook sheeting shall type IX.

121) Contract 258415-1 calls for type IX sheeting on all signs, contract 258415-2 does not have a specification for sheeting type. Is 258415-2 standard Florida specification or is it the higher specification type IX sheeting?

Response: : (9/14/09) Per Turnpike Plans Preparation and Practices Handbook sheeting shall be type IX for 258415-1. For 258415-2, standard Florida specifications shall apply.

122) Pay item #0544-75-13 does not match up with the QPL item #0544-75-13 description; either the description or pay item # is incorrect. Standards call for designer to use shortest attenuator that meets roadway design speed; I can only find 62mph react cushions on the QPL. If a 62mph attenuator is acceptable, the Heart (0544-75-37) looks to be a suitable option. Thank you

Response: (9/14/09) Pay item #0544-75-13 is not an optional crash cushion. The 0544-75-13 crash cushion is the React 350 per Basis of Estimates and is the intended pay item for use along this section of the Selmon Expressway to I-4 connector. After

thorough investigation and coordination with FDOT D-7 the React 350 was the logical choice for this location. The 70mph remark on the summary of quantities table should read 62mph. The manufacturer's website indicates that the React 350 is capable of handling speeds up to 62mph.

Submitted 09/11/09:

- 123) There are several QPL options (0544-75-40) that are considered equal to 0544-75-14; it is possible for contractors to bid option 0544-75-40? Thank you.

Response: (9/14/09) The Department would accept an alternate attenuator for pay item 0544-75-14 provided it meets the requirements of the plans, applicable specifications, and roadway design standards. This substitution would be at no cost to the Department.

Submitted 09/14/09:

- 124) The fencing for this project proposed is calling out Smith Fence and Merchants Metals neither of which are on the FDOT approved vendors list. We are the only vendor I am aware of that is on this list. We were placed on this list after a long and exhaustive quality plan and a site visit from the state of Florida. We are also the only vendor that can meet the current ARRA stimulus requirements. Please consider changing this basic spec on the ornamental fence and chain link fence to be fair to the vendors that have went through the 6 month process of getting approved for the vendors list.

Response: (9/14/09) The TSP for the ornamental fencing does not limit the contractor to the manufacturers listed.

- 125) In reference to item # 0546 72 51 rumble strips ground-in 16" minimum width. There are 4 locations showing 7.20 PM without notations that these are alternative bids. This item number is used for asphaltic rumble strips, but I have been told by prime contractors, this project is on concrete pavement. How can a subcontractor tell the difference between asphalt and concrete rumble strips if the item numbers being used within the project bid letting are the same and no mention anywhere on the bid items listing on FDOT, Bid Data Line or Bid Express? Please verify if these are actually 4 alternative bids. Is this all on concrete pavement? Is there any asphalt pavement for rumble strip installation? Thank you, Michelle Rife Thomas Grinding Inc. Estimator and Contract Administrator

Response: (9/15/09) 1. Please refer to the contract plan sheets to find the types of shoulder pavement where rumble strips are installed. 2. The four bid items for pay item #0546-72-51 are for each of the four alternatives. 3. Please refer to the contract plan sheets to find the types of shoulder pavement where rumble strips are installed.