



ADDENDUM TO INVITATION FOR BID

October 8, 2019

TO: Concerned Bidders

RE: Addendum No. 6: **IFB-KW-19-244 – Ridge Road Extension – Phase I**

Please make note to the following changes, additions, deletions and clarifications to the above referenced solicitation:

CLARIFICATIONS

1. ~~Original Bid Closing Date: Tuesday, October 15, 2019 at 1:30pm~~

New Bid Closing Date: Monday, October 21, 2019 at 1:30pm

2. **A new Part III – Bid Proposal (which includes an updated bid schedule) is attached as part of this Addendum. The new Bid Proposal form (including the updated bid schedule) will replace and supersede the Bid Proposal section included with the original Bid documents at the time of advertisement.**

FAILURE ON THE PART OF ANY BIDDER TO SUBMIT THE BID PROPOSAL FORM ATTACHED TO THIS ADDENDUM WILL BE GROUNDS FOR REJECTION OF THAT BIDDER'S BID.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1: The plan sheets and MOT sheets do not appear to make provisions for the Suncoast Bike Trail operations for the construction of the roadway. Please provide clarification on what provisions must be made to keep the bike trail open, or will it be closed during construction?

Answer 1: The existing trail must be maintained and open to the public bicycle and pedestrian traffic at all times. Additional details are provided on the revised Temporary Traffic Control Plans, located in the Revised Roadway Plan Sheets attached with this Addendum.

Question 2: Will the Turnpike Authority allow the contractor to use the Suncoast Parkway proposed ramps as ingress-egress points under the proper MOT indexes to be submitted in the MOT plan for work within the FTE corridor?

Answer 2: Pasco County is negotiating with FTE to allow for access however access to the Suncoast Parkway cannot be assumed at this time. Please note, however, that the County has included a new Alternate 2 on the Bid Schedule and on the summary page of the updated Bid Proposal Form that provides for the bidders to include a monthly credit to the County for each month the selected Contractor will have access through the Florida Turnpike Enterprise's property that the County reserves the right to exercise during the term of the Contract. This Alternate will not be used in the calculation for purposes of determining the lowest bid.

Part II – Conditions of the Contract, B. Special Conditions is amended to add the following new paragraph:

10. ACCESS CREDIT. CONTINGENT UPON THE COUNTY’S RECEIPT OF PERMISSION TO UTILIZE THE FLORIDA TURNPIKE ENTERPRISE (FTE)’S PROPOSED SUNCOAST PARKWAY RAMPS OR THE FTE CORRIDOR FOR ACCESS TO THE PROJECT SITE, THE COUNTY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO EXERCISE THE OPTION PROVIDED FOR UNDER ALTERNATE 2 IN THE BID PROPOSAL REGARDING A MONTHLY CREDIT FOR ACCESS THROUGH FTE PROPERTY. WRITTEN NOTICE OF THE EXERCISE OF SUCH OPTION WILL BE PROVIDED BY THE COUNTY TO THE CONTRACTOR AND THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE OBLIGATED TO INCLUDE THE CREDIT AMOUNT IN QUESTION ON EACH MONTHLY PAYMENT APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY THEREAFTER OR UNTIL OTHERWISE NOTIFIED BY THE COUNTY. THE CREDIT AMOUNT INLCUDED FOR ALTERNATE 2 WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNTY WHEN DETERMINING THE LOWEST BID FOR PURPOSES OF CONTRACT AWARD.

Question 3: Can the CADD layer for soil boring locations be provided along with the CADD files?

Answer 3: CADD Files were provided with Addendum 5.

Question 4: Under SP-3 Gopher Tortoise Survey the contractor is required to stake the limits of construction for the GTA. Can the installation of the silt fence be used for this demarcation, as well as, provide for exclusionary purposes?

Answer 4: The use of silt fence for the demarcation as well as for exclusionary purposes is acceptable; however, the Contractor will be solely responsible for any issues (including delays) or additional costs resulting from their chosen methods. Please note that the Gopher Tortoise items are now included in the updated Bid Proposal as Alternate 1.

Question 5: Can the FWC permit for this relocation be provided?

Answer 5: The FWC permit is being pursued currently and will be provided when available.

Question 6: There appears to be a discrepancy with contract time. The agreement states that the contractor has 1000 days to complete the project from the NTP, however based on the calculations below there is only 881 days to bid and execute a contract for a 1/1/20 NTP. Please clarify that the milestone dates will be adjusted to reflect the 1000 day duration.

	Milestones		\$15,000			
NTP	1/1/2020	Cal Days	Bonus	Days Early	Bonus Date	Cal Days
ML 1	7/28/2020	209.00	\$195,000	13	7/15/2020	196.00
ML 2	5/31/2021	516.00	\$1,500,000	100	2/20/2021	416.00
ML 3	5/31/2022	881.00	\$705,000	47	4/14/2022	834.00

1000 Calendar Days
 9/4/2019 5/23/20 Start Date
 9/27/2022 NTP 1/1/20 Completion Date (1000 days)

5/31/22 or 9/27/22?

Answer 6: Yes, the intent (see SC-5) is that milestone 3 would be considered met once Substantial Completion was reached as defined in the General Conditions. The 1000 days is the maximum number of days for Final Completion of the Project and does not in any way change the timelines for the milestones. Should the NTP date be postponed, a commensurate change will be made in the milestone dates.

Question 7: Please also clarify that the 180 days for allowance work will extend the affected milestones when such work is issued, and that the overall contract time would be 1,180 days.

- Answer 7:** Yes, if all the Allowance Time was granted by the COUNTY, the maximum Contract Time would be 1,180 days. Allowance Time, however, is approved at the SOLE discretion of the County. Any Allowance Time granted may be added to the initial Contract Time defined in Part IV – Agreement of the Contract Documents if that time is approved for the use provided for under the Contract Documents by the appropriate County process prior to the expiration of the Contract Time. The inclusion of Allowance Time should not be assumed by a Contractor in calculating its work schedule.
- Question 8: The agreement also references Alternate #1 in item 7. Please clarify that there are no alternates for this bid.
- Answer 8:** The Bid Proposal has been updated to show one alternate specific to Gopher Tortoise activities.
- Question 9: Please provide a cross section at Station 215+00.
- Answer 9:** Cross section at Station 215+00 was provided with a previous Addendum 4.
- Question 10: There appears to be overhead power at Town Center Blvd crossing the Ridge Road alignment. Please clarify and provide the UAO agreement for this utility.
- Answer 10:** WREC has not yet provided a Final UAO. Preliminary UAO is attached.
- Question 11: Structure S-14 is a Type C Ditch Bottom Inlet W J Bottom but there is no pay item for this structure. Could a pay item be added for this structure?
- Answer 11:** Pay Item 425-1-533 for INLETS, DITCH BOTTOM TYPE C MODIFIED- BACK OF SIDEWALK, J BOT, <10' with a quantity of 1 for S-14 is already included in the Summary of Pay Items.
- Question 12: Please confirm if the Contractor Responsibility Survey for Engineering and Construction Services, Part III, Exhibit F, of the Bid Proposal needs to be submitted with the bid or is only the apparent low bidder required to submit these documents?
- Answer 12:** This Exhibit is required to be submitted with the sealed bid by all bidders.
- Question 13: There is conflicting information on sheet 97-98 and their corresponding drainage sections sheet 182-183, please review and correct.
- Answer 13:** Drainage structure and pipe callouts have been updated and the corresponding drainage cross sections have been updated accordingly. Updated plan sheets are attached with this Addendum.
- Question 14: In the drainage cross sections there seems to be some pages missing, the last structure is S-217, please correct and clarify if these are part of this contract or part of the future contract.
- Answer 14:** Drainage cross sections for all drainage structures have been added. Updated plan sheets are attached with this Addendum.
- Question 15: Will the box culverts on the project be allowed to be precast per index 292? If so, please provide the precast design criteria.
- Answer 15:** Precast box culverts as a Contractor-designed substitution is allowed, calculation and shop drawing prepared by the Contractor must be signed and sealed by a FL PE and must be submitted for approval by the Professional and the County. Design should follow FDOT Structures Design Guidelines as stated in General Notes under Index No. 292 Sheet 2 of 14.
- Question 16: The P-7 manhole at station 31+50 does not have a structure number and is not included in the drainage summary. Please provide a structure number and revise the bid item for P-7 manhole.

- Answer 16:** Drainage Structure 201A at Station 31+50.00 includes the P-7 manhole, pipe, and endwall per the Summary of Drainage Structures.
- Question 17: We request further clarification on the Field Office; size of the office, furnishings required, etc.
- Answer 17:** The Field Office has been removed from the Bid Sheet. If the Contractor requires a Field Office, the cost should be included under 101-1: Mobilization.
- Question 18: Structure S-94 on sheet 146 is depicted as a type S inlet but is shown as a P-7 Manhole in the description on the page. Please clarify and adjust bid quantities.
- Answer 18:** Summary of Drainage Structures and description in the Drainage Cross Sections of Structure have been updated for S-94H to Type S Gutter Inlet <10'. See Updated Plan Sheets attached with this Addendum.
- Question 19: Structure S-94D is depicted as a Type S inlet on sheet 148 but is described as a barrier wall inlet on the page. Please clarify and adjust bid quantity.
- Answer 19:** S-94D is a Type P Barrier Wall Inlet. The drainage cross section for S-94D was updated to include barrier wall. See Updated Plan Sheets attached with this Addendum.
- Question 20: According to Specification 570-4, Performance Turf Establishment, the contractor must "Perform all work necessary, including watering and fertilizer, to sustain and establish turf until final acceptance, at no additional cost to the Department". This specification places the responsibility on the contractor to ensure the sod is established. Since the contractor will be held accountable for an established turf and the prepared soil layer will add substantial monies to the project without improving the required performance, we request that the Prepared soil Layer not be required and removed from the bid form, please confirm.
- Answer 20:** No modifications to Specification 570-4 are being made at this time.
- Question 21: General Note #7 on Sheet A-6 in the structures plans call for the bridge substructure concrete to be Class IV-5500 psi but bid item 400 2 5 calls for Concrete Class II, Bridge Substructure. Please clarify.
- Answer 21:** General note is correct. The bid item has been changed to 400-4-5 Concrete Class IV, Bridge Substructure in the updated Bid Proposal Form attached.
- Question 22: Please provide the as-built drawings for the Suncoast Bike Trail project.
- Answer 22:** CADD Files were provided with Addendum 5 that included the survey of the existing Suncoast trail.
- Question 23: The Square Foot and Cubic Yard quantities do not seem to be calculating correctly for Pond No. 6. Sheet No.'s 515-517. Can we verify that Pond 6 has a total of 90,500 CY of Regular Excavation?
- Answer 23:** Regular Excavation quantity for Pond 6 has been revised to 89,999 CY in the updated Bid Schedule attached.
- Question 24: As a follow up to Question #48 in Addendum #3, when is the ACOE permit expected to be received?
- Answer 24:** Early November 2019.
- Question 25: In regard to bid item 101 2 – Pasco County ROW Permit, would the performance/payment and warranty bonds required in the contract fulfill the bond requirements for this permit?
- Answer 25:** The performance/payment and warranty bonds required in the contract will fulfill the bond requirements for the ROW use permit.
- Question 26: Could you provide the earthwork summary for Pond 14? There is no information in the existing information that has been provided.
- Answer 26:** Regular excavation quantity is 6,721 CY and embankment quantity is 6,602 CY for Pond 14.

- Question 27: What soil parameters should be assumed for the bridge MSE wing walls (i.e. walls 3-A-B through 13-G-H)? How much, if any, inundation, should be assumed for these walls? Should any settlement be assumed for these walls?
- Answer 27: See attached file “MSE Wall Soil Parameters”, (excerpt from Geotechnical Report).**
- Question 28: Per plans sh. 225, are there FDOT Standard Index numbers associated with the coping/barrier details? If there are not index numbers, can more dimensional detail be provided? The coping with barrier shown on this sheet appears to be much larger than that shown within the roadway cross-sections (see sh. 386 of roadway plans for an example).
- Answer 28: There is no FDOT Standard Index number associated with this detail. The coping shown in the cross-sections is for informational purposes only. The reason for its large size (6’ from top of barrier to bottom of coping) is that it has to accommodate the full depth pavement box and the depth of the moment slab. The moment slab is to be designed by the wall manufacturer, so we are not able to provide more dimensional detail. The wall manufacturer usually details the coping fully in the shop drawings, so as long as the barrier/moment slab meet AASHTO loading requirements and the barrier is the proper shape, the Contractor has a little leeway as far as final dimensions go.**
- Question 29: Per sh. 229, there is a culvert that penetrates the center of the MSE wall. Will a headwall be required at this location?
- Answer 29: For all culverts that pass through MSE walls, the intent is to provide a 1’ wide collar around the opening. The collar is shown graphically on the culvert cross section sheets, and is included as the dimension “Lw” on the Culvert Data Sheets.**
- Question 30: What aesthetic finish should be assumed for the panels, or should smooth finish be assumed?
- Answer 30: For structures at low level wetland crossings located in an undeveloped rural area, FDOT Level One aesthetic enhancements are not warranted. However, the locations alone will provide some aesthetic enhancement as the wetlands reestablish after construction and grow up adjacent to the structures. For structures along trail, roadway, or railroad located in a rural area, Level One aesthetic enhancement such as utilizing FDOT standard cast in patterns and color pigments should be assumed.**
- Question 31: Please provide more information for the MSE wing walls near bridges in order to more accurately provide an estimate (i.e. wall length for abutment walls, leveling pad elevations, top of coping elevations).
- Answer 31: See following sheets for MSE wing walls near bridges: BB-15 to BB-18, BC-16 to BC-19, BD-15 to BD-18, BE-16 to BE-19, BF-19 to BF-26, and BG-16 to BG-19.**
- Question 32: At station 180+00 the cross sections show the MSE wall leveling pad sitting on top of the existing force main. Is the County relocating this utility? Please clarify.
- Answer 32: The pipe is “to remain”. The Verify Utility Locate Sheet shows the top of utility elevation as 40.83’. The estimated bottom of leveling pad elevations is 42.14’ assuming a 6” pad (top of leveling pad = 42.64’). This provides roughly 15” between them. If this is not enough of a gap, the wall could be stepped if necessary.**
- Question 33: Please provide a detail showing how the existing bike trail is to be tied into the proposed design and maintain ADA compliance.
- Answer 33: This additional detail has been provided in the Temporary Traffic Control Plans. Please note that the Contractor will be required to submit a MOT plan (including for this section) for County approval upon award.**
- Question 34: Will arrow boards be required for the left turn closures at the intersection of Moon Lake & Ridge Road. Sheet 579 does not show them to be required. Please clarify the index to be used.
- Answer 34: Index 613 is called for on Sheet 579 (‘Install Traffic Safety Devices and Signs as per Standard Index 613 to close the Center Lane of Ridge Road’). The Index shows placement of the arrow board.**

- Question 35: Please provide detail and alignment on how the permanent fencing is to securely tie into the Suncoast Bike Trail and Suncoast Parkway alignments.
- Answer 35: CADD Files were provided with Addendum 5.**
- Question 36: Please provide any details required for temporary measures to keep these secure during construction.
- Answer 36: CADD Files were provided with Addendum 5.**
- Question 37: In reference to question #36; will the ACOE Permit be received prior to the bid date to determine?
- Answer 37: ACOE permit issuance expected early November 2019.**
- Question 38: Note 5 on Sheet 603 of the MOT plans states the contractor shall be responsible for restoration of area used for timber mats or temp fill, including maintenance, monitoring and reporting. The permit names and quantifies areas for permanent and temporary impacts but provides no graphic showing these locations. The permit also does not declare permanent impacts cause by bridge shading. Please provide clarification for the location and limits of these permanent shade impacts.
- Answer 38: The exhibit submitted in support of the SWFWMD permit is attached.**
- Question 39: Please confirm that if shade impacts are used for temp fill/mats that restoration efforts will be limited to regrading and that no planting or monitoring will be required as long as temporary impacts are limited to these areas.
- Answer 39: No impacts other than shading by the permanent bridge structure (and pile driving) are permitted within the shade impact areas. Temp fill/matts are only permitted within the areas between the bridges as indicated in the plans.**
- Question 40: The permit also does not prescribe what would be required for restoration in impact areas outside of kill zone. Please clarify these requirements.
- Answer 40: All temporary and permanent impact areas are indicated in the attached exhibit submitted in support of the SWFWMD permit. Restoration is required in temporary impact areas. Restoration is not required in permanent impact areas.**
- Question 41: According plan sheet 605 "Special Detail (3)", within the wetland areas the Contractor is required to stay within 5' of the proposed walls for clearing and construction operations. In some cases the foundations for the proposed MSE wall foundations are roughly 5' below existing ground and would require excavation limits to extend outside of 5' from the face of the wall. Please advise if the 5' limits can be modified to accommodate the needs of the wall operations.
- Answer 41: The detail on Sheet 605 shows the 5' dimension for the wall as "typical" and Note 2 ends with the phrase "except as needed to specifically provide for foundation construction." This was intended to provide for extending beyond the 5' typical dimension on a limited, as needed basis to provide for foundation construction.**
- Question 42: Within the wetland areas are locations that require subsoil excavation that in some cases extend beyond the 5' clearing limit from the face of the proposed walls that is defined on plan sheet 605 "Special Detail (3)". Please advise if this detail applies to subsoil excavation locations and if the limit can be modified to fit the excavation needs of the subsoil removal.
- Answer 42: Subsoil removal would be considered a part of "foundation construction". The detail on Sheet 605 in the original plan set shows the 5' dimension for the wall as "typical" and Note 2 ends with the phrase "except as-needed to specifically provide for foundation construction." This was intended to provide for extending beyond the 5' typical dimension on a limited, as-needed basis to provide for foundation construction.**
- Question 43: Please provide a modified ROW Use permit for the Contractor to use for this project. The County's current ROW Use permit dictates that the Contractor complete all work in 180 days or the permit is null and void.

- Answer 43:** The selected Contractor can request the ROW Use Permit be issued with a modified duration which is adequate to complete the required work, which will be granted.
- Question 44: The ROW Use Permit also states the contractor is to provide a surety performance guarantee to the County equal to 125% of the cost of construction which is in conflict with the payment bond provided in the bid documents. Please clarify.
- Answer 44:** Please provide payment bond as detailed in the bid documents. This will fulfill the requirements of the ROW use permit.
- Question 45: Will the County provide the approved permit prior to issuing the Notice to Proceed for the project?
- Answer 45:** ROW use permit will be approved within three working days of submission of completed application from the Contractor.
- Question 46: Under the County's Fee Schedule for ROW Use Permits there is no line item fee for Construction of Public Roadways. What is the fee associated with this permit and will it encumber all construction activities throughout the duration of the project?
- Answer 46:** The fee for the ROW Use Permit for construction of a County Capital Improvement Project will be waived.
- Question 47: Question # 55 references Four (4) Geotech reports, are these reports available to the bidders? If so, where can we find them?
- Answer 47:** The Geotechnical Reports were previously provided as attachment to the Specifications as part of the original bid document issued and are available in Bidnet.
- Question 48: There are major errors in the Summary of Quantity Sheets and Bid Form for all of the pavement items:
- A. There are station limits missing.
 - B. The summary items do not reflect what is shown in the Plan Typical Sections.
 - C. Per Plan Sheet SQ13, the FC5 total quantity is 8944.50 tons. The supporting data in the station to station calculations only equals 2040 tons. The incorrect quantity of FC5, which is almost **2 times the actual quantity**, is included on the bid form.
 - D. The only FC12.5 in the Typical Sections is the resurfacing and the Town Center Drive side street. These two locations do not equal 5128 tons. The incorrect quantity of FC12.5, which is almost **10 times the actual quantity**, is included on the bid form.
 - E. There are no pavement quantities shown for any items between Stations 12+09 to 25+40.
 - F. There almost too many inconsistencies and errors to list.
- Answer 48:**
- A. Pavement pay items in the Summary of Quantities have been revised.**
 - B. Pavement pay items in the Summary of Quantities have been revised.**
 - C. Pay Item 337-7-25 quantity in Phase 1 has been revised to be 3,636.8 TN.**
 - D. Pay Item 337-7-85 quantity in Phase 1 has been revised to 5,378.5TN.**
 - E. Pavement quantities have been revised and updated at this location.**
 - F. Payment pay items in the Summary of Quantities have been revised.**
- A revised Bid Schedule reflecting all the changes noted above is attached to this Addendum.**
- Question 49: In light of the above, please verify all pavement quantities.
- Answer 49:** Pavement pay items in the Summary of Quantities have been verified and revised. See Bid Schedule.
- Question 50: In your Roadway Plans it references the "Bridge Plans". Where or how do I gain access to the Bridge Plans? I cannot locate them on Bidnet. Please advise.
- Answer 50:** The referenced "Bridge Plans" are labeled STRUCTURAL PLANS on BidNet.

- Question 51: There are multiple folding signs identified on sheets S-25 & S-29, but no detail is given on how these are to be built. Only a single sign panel is shown in the guide sign worksheet, but no detail for the hinge, latches, brackets, etc. Please provide detail, so we can price these accordingly. Plus, there appears to be flashing beacons on these signs, but there is no pay item for them, or a description of how they are powered.
- Answer 51: Pay Item 700-12-21 has been added to the Summary of Pay Items, Signing and Pavement Marking plans, and the Bid Schedule included in the Bid Proposal attached. A note has been added to provide guidance for the Contractor in the Signing and Pavement Marking plans.**
- Question 52: It appears that the Item 548-12 Retaining Wall System, Permanent, Excluding Barrier quantity of 30,922 sf includes MSE walls at Bridge ends only. Could you provide a pay item and quantities for the MSE Walls 1 thru 29 as shown in drawings sheets 225 thru 256.
- Answer 52: Pay Item 548-12 quantity has been revised to 112,475 SF. See Bid Schedule.**
- Question 53: Does the quantity of item 400-2-5 Concrete Class IV, Superstructure 8,879 CY includes the quantity of thickening slabs at the expansion joint ends?
- Answer 53: No. See attached file "Revised Superstructure Sheets" for revised plans including this concrete quantity.**
- Question 54: What is the concrete thickness of the Shared Use Path at the Approach Slabs?
- Answer 54: The concrete slab for the shared use path is 13-3/4" thick. Please see "Section B-B Approach Slab with Sidewalk" detail on FDOT Standard Plans 400-090 for more information. Pay Items 400-4-4 Class IV Concrete (Superstructure) and 400-2-10 Class II Concrete (Approach Slab) were updated.**
- Question 55: It appears that the Gravity Wall about 100 LF shown in sheet 94 is not accounted in the item 400 0 11 Conc Class NS, Gravity Wall 3 CY.
- Answer 55: The Gravity wall has been lengthened to 150' and quantity updated to 48 CY in the Plan/Profile sheet, Summary of Quantities, Summary of Pay Items, and Bid Schedule.**
- Question 56: Note 3 on the 'Typical Bridge Piling Plan' detail on Sheet No. 605 states that "All pile driving operations and setting of bridge beams shall be performed from the temporary work platforms between the limits of the bridges". Please clarify if this allows for access underneath the bridges between the bent locations.
- Answer 56: Yes.**
- Question 57: Drainage structure S-118A called out on Sheets 43 & 154 is a Type 'S' GI w/ J-Bottom >10' with no associated bid item. Please clarify.
- Answer 57: Pay Item 425-1-704 was added to the Summary of Drainage Structures, Summary of Pay Items, and Bid Tab.**
- Question 58: There are numerous discrepancies between the Summary of Drainage Structures (Sheets 22-59), Plan/Profiles (Sheets 67-99) and Drainage Structures (Sheets 124-189). For example: a. Sheet 57 calls out Structure S-210 as a DBI "D" but Sheet 182 section calls out a DBI "B" w/ J-Bottom. b. Sheet 57 calls out Structure S-212 as a GI "V" but Sheet 182 section calls out a DBI "D" w/ J-Bottom. c. Sheet 57 calls out Structure S-212 as a GI "V" but Sheet 182 section calls out a DBI "B" w/ J-Bottom. d. The sheet summary on Sheet 59 list 4-each Type "V" GI's but there are none listed above. e. There are numerous discrepancies between Sheets 97/98 and 182/183.
- Answer 58: Summary of Drainage Structures, Plan/Profile, Drainage Cross Section sheets, and Bid Schedule have been revised. Pay Item 425-1-712 for S-212 has been added.**
- Question 59: Note #6 on all of the box culvert data sheets does not list the Long-Term Differential Settlement and Effective Length for Settlement. Could this information be provided?

- Answer 59:** The differential settlement is ½", and the effective length for settlement (L) should be just the length of the culvert for new culverts. See attached "Box Culvert Sheets" for revised plans with this information.
- Question 60: Would the County accept a copy of a digital signature required on BP-8 of the Bid Proposal?
- Answer 60:** An original signature is required.
- Question 61: Is the County going to take beneficial occupancy of each completed milestone's roadway at milestone date?
- Answer 61:** This is not contemplated at this time.
- Question 62: Has the County considered the impact of a million cubic yards of import fill being hauled in over completed milestone roadway prior to having the full structural number (85%) (1.5" FC-5) installed?
- Answer 62:** The Contractor shall be solely responsible for their construction methodology and phasing including costs, delays, and any necessary protection of repair of completed work which is impacted by future work.
- Question 63: Please provide a quantity table and pay item for detectable warning surfaces.
- Answer 63:** Pay Item 527-2 has been added to the Summary of Pay Items and Bid Schedule included with the Bid Proposal. The Summary of Sidewalk and Detectable Warnings tables have been added to the Summary of Quantities.
- Question 64: There appears to be a conflict in the wording for the Phase 2 Milestone and what is depicted to be completed on Sheet 602 of the TCP Plans. Please confirm that the traffic pattern shown on Sheet 602 of the TCP plans is the requirement to satisfy completion of the Phase 2 Milestone and that there is no cross over at the east end of the project. If a cross-over is required, please provide a detail for this work.
- Answer 64:** A cross-over is not required for Milestone 2.
- Question 65: Commercial Liability Insurance Limits are specified at \$10,000,000. Is this required and to be passed down to Subcontractors?
- Answer 65:** Under the contract the Contractor is responsible for all work performed for the Project, including that performed by its subcontractors.
- Question 66: Business Auto Liability Insurance Limits are specified at \$5,000,000. Is this required and to be passed down to Subcontractors?
- Answer 66:** Under the contract the Contractor is responsible for all work performed for the Project, including that performed by its subcontractors.
- Question 67: Could the following language be deleted from the contract as the Contractor has no control over third-party approvals: a. Part II, Article 14.1 Warranty and Guarantee. "To the extent the Work may be required in order to achieve and maintain compliance with any permit issued by any federal or state authority (e.g., mitigation planting required as a condition of a permit by the Southwest Florida Water Management District) and no written final approval by said authority has been received within one year following Final Acceptance, the CONTRACTOR shall warrant and guarantee that portion of the Work beyond one (1) year and until such time as written final approval has been issued by the applicable authority."
- Answer 67:** No changes to the language in question will be considered.
- Question 68: What is the annual appropriation authorized by the County referenced in Part I, IB, § 25 (Non-Appropriation)?
- Answer 68:** The County must approve the remaining contract balance each year as part of its annual budget process.

- Question 69: In reference to Part II, § 12.5(iii) (Non-Recoverable Items). Could a mutual waiver of consequential damages clause be included in the contract to avoid the inclusion of large contingencies to the contract price.
- Answer 69: No.**
- Question 70: In reference to Part II, § 15.13 & Part IV, Sample Agreement, Paragraph 5, (Liquidated Damages). The amount of liquidated damages stated in Paragraph 5 of the Sample Agreement is blank. What is the liquidated damages regime for this contract?
- Answer 70: As reflected in Addendum 3, the liquidated damages amount is \$12,052 per day.**
- Question 71: Please verify the location of bid item # 400-1-2 - CONCRETE CLASS I, ENDWALLS – 200 CY.
- Answer 71: This pay item includes estimated concrete quantities the wingwalls at the box culverts (see box culvert data sheets) and Class I concrete quantities shown in the Summary of Drainage Structures sheets included in the Revised Roadway Plans attached with this addendum.**
- Question 72: The test pile quantities in the pile data table do not match the bid quantities, please clarify? For instance, bridge 7 shows 4 test piles in the pile data table but the summary of quantities only includes 2 test piles.
- Answer 72: The column “Test Pile Length” in the pile data table is the recommended test pile length from the geotechnical engineer. This is given for information purposes only. Although every bent shows a test pile length in this table, not every bent requires a test pile. In general, a test pile is required at every third bent. For example, bridge 7 only requires 2 test piles (one a Bent 1, and one at Bent 4). The test pile notes on drawing BD-6 clarifies which bents require test piles for bridge 7. The bid quantities reflect the correct quantities for the required test piles.**
- Question 73: On sheet BD-10, the top view of the footer appears to have 3 rows of piling but the end view at the bottom of the page only includes 2 rows of piling, please clarify?
- Answer 73: There are only two rows of piles. The center row of dashed squares in the top view of the footer represents the bent column between the bent cap and the footing, see “End View” section on this sheet.**
- Question 74: Please refer to Plan Sheets for Drainage Pipe Layout -Please clarify correct hanger spacing and layout for Bridge Drain hangers.
- Answer 74: The maximum hanger spacing is 8'-0". The threaded insert groups are provided so the hanger locations are flexible, and the contractor can make field adjustments as necessary as long as the spacing requirements provided in the notes on the “Drainage Pipe Layout” sheets are met.**
- Question 75: Please refer to Plan Sheets for Drainage Plan and Grade - Pipe details are being extended past the headwall, but the pipe is not accounted for in the bridge drain LF, please specify pay item that the remaining pipe should be paid under.
- Answer 75: The quantities for Pay Item 506-2 were added to the Summary of Pay Items, Summary of Drainage Structure sheets, and Bid Tab.**
- Question 76: Please refer to Plan Sheets for Deck Drain Details -Please specify hanger detail or type of roller to be utilized? (non-metallic polyurethane, steel, or cast roller)
- Answer 76: Specify hot dip galvanized hangers for all attachments to the bridge structure where the superstructure environment is classified as slightly or moderately aggressive. Specify 316 Stainless steel hangers for all attachments to the bridge structure where the superstructure is classified as extremely aggressive. See sheet A-6 note #4 for environmental classification.**
- Question 77: The Summary of quantities (sheet SQ-29) shows sidewalk from station 50+07.97 - 96+00.00 but no sidewalk is shown on the roadway plans corresponding with these stations.

Answer 77: Plans show 4" concrete sidewalk ending at Station 50+20.00, 58.00' LT. The Summary of Quantities and Summary of Pay Items were revised to remove quantities of 4" concrete sidewalk not shown on plans.

Question 78: Discharge Structures provide ample EL. Information but lacks overall length of weirs. Please can you ask the EOR to provide overall weir length for each weir/discharge structure.

Answer 78: Weir Dimensions Tables show Half Weir Lengths (ft). Please see Discharge Structures sheets for reference.

Bidders should acknowledge receipt of this addendum on the Bid Form. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum may be cause for rejection. The opening date will remain unchanged.

I appreciate your kind cooperation and regret any inconvenience this may have caused. If there are any additional questions, please contact the Purchasing Department at (727) 847-8194.

Sincerely,

Kimberlie Miller
Sr. Purchasing Agent

ATTACHMENTS:

Addendum 6 – Updated Bid Proposal
Addendum 6 - Updated Bid Schedule (part of Bid Proposal)
MSE Wall Soil Parameters
Revised Pond 14 Detail Sheets
Revised Roadway Plan Sheets
Revised S&PM Plan Sheets
Revised Structure Plan Sheets
WREC – Preliminary UWS