



Financial Management Department
Purchasing Division
1112 Manatee Ave W Suite 803
Bradenton, FL 34205
Phone: (941) 749-3014
www.mymanatee.org

January 15, 2015

TO: All Interested Bidders
SUBJECT: Invitation for Bids #14-3257CD
Fort Hamer Bridge Project with Road Improvements on Fort Hamer Road
and Upper Manatee River Road (U.M.R.R)

ADDENDUM #3

Bidders are hereby notified that this Addendum shall be acknowledged on page Bid Form-1 of the Bid Form and made a part of the above named bidding and contract documents. Bids submitted without acknowledgment of the Addendum will be considered incomplete.

The following items are issued to add to, modify, and clarify the bid and contract documents. These items shall have the same force and effect as the original bidding and contract documents, and cost involved shall be included in the bid prices. Bids to be submitted on the specified bid date, shall conform to the additions and revisions listed herein.

- 1) **ADD** the following Clarification of Specific Pay Items for Fort Hamer Road to page 26 of the Special Provisions:
 - Pay item #48, Epoxy grouted dowels; this pay item is for the connection of the two endwalls at station 111+53.94. This pay item shall include Epoxy, Steel and Grouted Dowels.
 - Pay item #51, Gravity wall steel and end treatment for the connection of the endwall and gravity wall at station 111+53.94 shall be included in the unit cost.
 - Pay item #58, This pay item includes adjustments to existing grade of the existing boxes and new traffic bearing lids. Please see Stations 34+00.
 - Pay item #92, This 36" RCP SD shall be paid as a CD pipe. Please bid accordingly to this description.
- 2) **DELETE** Plan Sheets 1, 2, 28, and 70 of the Fort Hamer Road Roadway Plans (323-6054764) and **INSERT** the REVISED Plan Sheets 1, 2, 28, and 70 of the Fort Hamer Road Roadway Plans (323-6054764) that are attached to this Addendum #3.
- 3) **DELETE** Plan Sheets 1, 5A, 7, 8, 20, and 21B of the Upper Manatee River Road Roadway Plans (307-6082660) and **INSERT** the REVISED Plan Sheets 1, 5A, 7, 8, 20, and 21B of the Upper Manatee River Road Roadway Plans (307-6082660) that are attached to this Addendum #3.
- 4) **DELETE** the interactive Excel Bid Form issued with Addendum #1 and **INSERT** the REVISED interactive Excel Bid Form that is issued with this Addendum #3.

5) CLARIFICATIONS OF ENGINEER'S CHANGES:

a) Fort Hamer Bridge:

i) Bid Form Changes:

- (1) Pay items #3 thru #10- The quantities for these items have been modified for Bid Option "B" only.
- (2) Pay item # 106A- This pay item has been added to the bid form.
- (3) Pay item # 106B- This pay item has been added to the bid form.
- (4) Pay item # 116- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (5) Pay item # 117- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (6) Pay item # 203- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (7) Pay item #205- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (8) Pay item #206- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (9) Pay item #207- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (10) Pay item #208- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (11) Pay item #209- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (12) Pay item #220- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (13) Pay item #253- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.

b) Fort Hamer Road:

i) Construction Plan Changes:

- (1) Sheet no. 1- Revision description note has been added to the cover sheet.
- (2) Sheet no. 2- Quantity sheet has been updated.
- (3) Sheet no. 28- Proposed gravity wall was extended. New notes have been added to the plan sheet.
- (4) Sheet no. 70-The cross section # 112 has been modified.

ii) Special Provisions Clarification of Specific Line Items:

- (1) Clarification for Pay item # 48 has been added.
- (2) Clarification for Pay item # 51 has been added.
- (3) Clarification for Pay item # 58 has been added.
- (4) Clarification for Pay item # 92 has been added.

iii) Bid Form changes:

- (1) Pay item # 38- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (2) Pay item # 48- FDOT Pay item Number #0400-136 has been changed to # 0400-MC. Quantity and description for this pay item have been changed.
- (3) Pay item # 51- The quantity has been increased.
- (4) Pay item # 94- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (5) Pay item # 100- A quantity for this pay item has been added to this pay item.
- (6) Pay item # 106- The quantity for this pay item has been moved to pay item 112.
- (7) Pay item # 112- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (8) Pay item # 133A- This pay item has been added to the bid form.

c) Upper Manatee River Road:

i) Construction Plan Changes:

- (1) Sheet no. 1- "Cover Sheet" has been updated to show revision description note.
- (2) Sheet no. 5A-"Summary of Pay Items" has been updated.
- (3) Sheet no. 7- "Plan and Profile" has been updated.
- (4) Sheet no. 8-"Plan and Profile" has been updated.
- (5) Sheet no. 20-"Plan and Profile" has been updated.
- (6) Sheet no. 21 B-"Structure and Pipe Schedule" has been updated.

ii) Bid Form changes:

- (1) Pay item # 38- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (2) Pay item # 85- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (3) Pay item # 86- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (4) Pay item # 94- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (5) Pay item # 95- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (6) Pay item # 97- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (7) Pay item # 99- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (8) Pay item # 100- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (9) Pay item # 102- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (10) Pay item # 106- The quantity for this pay item has been zeroed out.
- (11) Pay item # 107- The quantity for this pay item has been zeroed out.
- (12) Pay item # 108- The quantity for this pay item has been zeroed out.
- (13) Pay item # 111- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (14) Pay item # 112- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (15) Pay item # 113- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.
- (16) Pay item # 269- The quantity for this pay item has been modified.

6) **CHANGE** the Due Date and Time to **Friday, January 23, 2015 at 3:00 PM.**

The following questions have been presented by potential bidders:

Question #1: Please identify the location of the Epoxy Concrete Overlay – Structures Rehab”

Response #1: Bid item #48, The Epoxy Concrete Overlay- Structures Rehab, has been replaced by Epoxy Grouted Dowels, LS. The Location is at station 111+53.94 RT. This pay item is for the connection of the proposed endwall to the existing ones at station 111+53.94. This pay item shall include epoxy, steel and grouted dowels, and all labor necessary. Clarification of this line item and plans changes have also been added to the Special Provisions (see item #1 above of this Addendum #3).

Question #2: Reference Fort Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheet no. 29, at station 115+57.4, we are instructed to construct a concrete block box 4’x3’4” with traffic bearing lid, the closest bid item for this size box is pay item no. 59 and that structure is on Upper Manatee River Road according to the bid form, please advise on where to include the structure on Fort Hamer Road.

Response #2: The structure was included in pay item # 57. Please see bid form.

Question #3: Reference bid form, pay item no. 58, Traffic Bearing Lid, are these lids to have traffic bearing manhole frames and covers, or are they just solid traffic bearing concrete top slabs that will be buried?

Response #3: Pay item no. 58 includes adjustments and new traffic bearing lids manholes and frames covers. Please see clarification of line items of the Special Provisions.

Question #4: Reference bid form, pay item no. 58, Traffic Bearing Lid, Ft. Hamer Road quantity shows nine (9) each, I find six (6) and that includes three (3) new junction box structures. First, why aren’t the new junction box structures being paid to include the cost of the “Traffic Bearing Lid”? Second, where are the other three (3)?

Response #4: Pay item # 58 includes adjustments to existing grade of the existing boxes and new traffic bearing lids. A description of this pay item has been added to the clarification of pay items on the Special Provision. The construction of the new junction boxes is paid under item 57. Please see from station 34+00 to 39+00 left side. The other adjustments and construction of new traffic bearing lid are at intersection of Old Tampa Road and Golf Course Road.

Question #5: Reference Fort Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheet no. 29, Type 'C' Modified Inlet at station 117+59, this is the second Type 'C' Modified inlet I have found on Fort Hamer Road, bid form tells us there is only one(1), please clarify.

Response #5: Fort Hamer Road plan has one (1) Type C modified at station 117+59, pay item #71. The M.C. modified at station 101 +99.93 32.04' LT shall be paid by pay item # 56 drop Inlet. Please bid accordingly to this pay item.

Question #6: Reference Fort Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheet no. 34, at station 141+8.13, plan shows a flume per F.D.O.T. Index 216. Index 216, Sheet 1 of 3, Design Notes, Note 2, tells us the designer is to specify the flume type, the 'D' dimension, number of barrels, etc., please provide the information Note 2 is requiring.

Response #6: This flume shall be Type I, single barrel. "D" is the width of sidewalk plus curb top, say 6.5' Please follow FDOT design standards 216 Sheet 1 of 3 for dimensions of the flume. The item shall be paid under pay item #50, including concrete, steels and labors.

Question #7: Reference Fort Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheet no. 23, station 81+45.49, plans show installing a 6'x8' 'J' bottom structure, it appears there is a 38"x60" ERCP pipe that is to be connected to the west side of this structure and if this is the case a 6'-0" wide box will not accept the pipe as F.D.O.T. criteria requires at least 6-inches of wall on each side from the inside corner of the structure to the outside edge of the opening for the pipe. Please review this structures' size.

Response #7: Station 81+45.49 J bottom structure has been changed to 7'x 8' inside dimensions. All Dimensions for the drainage boxes called out on the plans are for the inside dimensions of the structure.

Question #8: Reference Fort Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheet no. 28, station 113+98.66, where is the County considering the "rim" at elevation 41.20 of this structure to be located at, the leading edge of the grate frame or the top of the hood at the top of back of curb?

Response #8: The rim elevation of 41.20 is for the top of the curb. Please see sheet no. 28.

Question #9: Reference bid form, pay item 48, Epoxy Concrete Overlay, where is this work at? Cannot find on Ft. Hamer Road Phase II plans. Please clarify.

Response #9: Station 111+53.94 sheet 28. Bid item #48, The Epoxy Concrete Overlay-Structures Rehab, has been replaced by Epoxy Grouted Dowels, LS.

Question #10: Reference bid form, pay item 57, Junction Box, bid quantity shows these five (5) structures to be in Ft. Hamer Road, I find four (4). Please clarify.

Response #10: Please see the responses to questions #2 through #4 above.

Question #11: Reference bid form, pay item 133, Pipe Handrail-Guiderail Aluminum; this pay item is for an F.D.O.T. Index 870 rail. Now, please reference Ft. Hamer Road Phase II plans, Typical Section at the top half of plan sheet seven (7), this section calls out both Index 870 and Index 862. There is no pay item for an Index 862 rail and this type rail is more expensive than the Index 870. If we are to install Index 862 rail please add a pay item for it.

Response #11: The majority of handrail to be installed in this project is the FDOT Index 870 100 LF Handrail per Index 862 for drop off more than 60" shall be installed from ST 111+00 to ST 112+00. A new pay item 133 A has been added to address this change.

Question #12: Reference bid form, pay item 151, Guardrail-Roadway, Ft. Hamer Road Qty. shows 1,253LF, but bid form does not have any end anchorage assemblies to accommodate this guardrail. Guardrail should not be installed on a public roadway without end anchor assemblies, please review. This may also be an issue for the Upper Manatee River Road side of the project.

Response #12: Please see page 26 and 27 of the Special Provisions, Clarification of Specific line items, Line item # 151 clarified the payment of anchored assemblies shall be included in this pay item.

Question #13: Reference bid form, pay item 99, 18"/CD, Ft. Hamer Road Qty. does not show any 18-inch cross drain, but I find 15LF on plan sheet 19 at station 63+00, please clarify.

Response #13: Fort Hamer Road plans do not have any proposed 18"/ CD or 15"/CD. The quantity for pay item # 106 has been moved to pay item # 112.

Question #14: Reference plan set 6035560, Fort Hamer Bridge, and bid form, pay item 134, Pedestrian/Bicycle Railing, Steel, 42" Type 1, bid form shows 350LF, but Plan Sheet 15, Summary of Railing does not show it and I cannot find it on the roadway plans. Where does it go?

Response #14: Pedestrian/Bicycle Railing is to be constructed along the top of the retaining wall between stations 119+25.00 and 122+75.00. See sheet number 9, Typical Section (4), retaining wall detail and sheet numbers 32 and 33, Plan Sheets 5 and 6 for placement. Refer to indices 6130 and 822 for details.

Question #15: Reference bid form, pay item 135, Handrail, what Index number applies to this handrail?

Response #15: The appropriate index for handrail is 862.

Question #16: Reference plan set 307-6082660, Upper Manatee River Road, plan sheet 19 shows a type Flared end anchor on the guardrail and plan sheet 20 shows a type Parallel end anchor on the other end of the guardrail, but the bid form does not call for any end anchor systems for Upper Manatee River Road, please clarify.

Response #16: The components of the anchorage assemblies are included in the "Guardrail-Roadway" pay item. Please refer to clarification on specific line items on Special Provisions.

Question #17: Reference bid form, pay item 133, Pipe Handrail-Guiderail Aluminum, U.M.R.R. Qty. shows 170LF, and this is Index 870, but plan sheets 37 and 37A the detail shows Index 862, what are we bidding? If we are to bid Index 862 railing then a bid item needs to be added to the bid form.

Response #17: The "pipe handrail -guiderail aluminum" details are based on Index 870 please bid accordingly.

Question #18: Reference bid form, pay item 100, 12"x18"/CD, the Ft. Hamer Road Qty. does not show any for this item, I find 66LF on the Ft. Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheet 25 at approximately station 96+65, please clarify. It appears that this 66 LF of cross drain may be included in the side drain pipe quantity for 12"x18" ERCP, pay item 94.

Response #18: The quantities for pay items no. 100 and no. 94 have been changed in order to separate 12"x 18" CD from SD. Please see updated bid form.

Question #19: Reference bid form, pay item no. 94, 12"x18"/SD, bid form quantity for Ft. Hamer Road shows 589LF, I find 509LF, please review.

Response #19: Pay item no. 94 the quantity of this pay item has been changed in order to separate 12"x 18" CD from SD. Please see updated bid form.

Question #20: Reference bid form, pay item no. 106, MES Optional (RCP) 18"/CD, Ft. Hamer Road Qty. shows 14-each of these mitered ends, I can only find two (2) on sheet 19 at station 62+95. The other 18" mitered end pipe on Ft. Hamer Road are SIDE DRAIN MITERS, and there are ten (10) of those, and they belong in Pay Item 112 that currently does not show any for Ft. Hamer Road.

Response #20: The quantity for this pay item has been moved to pay item 112. Please see updated bid form.

Question #21: Reference bid form, pay item no. 139, Traffic Separator Concrete Type I, 4' Wide, and Ft. Hamer Road Phase II plans, plan sheets 60 – 62, the traffic separator drawn on the cross sections are drawn as an Option I type separator and not as a Type I separator that the bid item is calling out. It makes sense to install the Type I separator over the existing asphalt surface and not have to excavate into the existing road bed as would have to be done to construct the type of separator the cross sections are showing. Please confirm what type of separator we are to construct.

Response #21: The concrete separator shall be FDOT type IV, option 1.

Question #22: Please clarify bid quantity of 1 SF for Pay item 48 "Epoxy Concrete Overlay" is accurate and what we should use for our bid proposal.

Response #22: The unit for pay item number # 48 has been changed to LS. Please see item #1 of this Addendum #3 for clarification of line items added to the Special Provision.

Question #23: Reference bid form Pay Item No. 28, Upper Manatee River Road Quantity and Pay Item No. 32, Upper Manatee River Road Quantity, I find it ironic that these quantities are the same, shouldn't there be more stabilized sub-grade than base? Please review.

Response #23: Based on Manatee County's road connection detail 403.3 the base is 1 foot longer than the sub-base toward the road center line while the sub-base is 1foot longer in the opposite direction. The base and sub-base have the same length, which leads to the same quantities. Please refer to the typical sections and the County Std. 403.3.

Question #24: After reviewing the plans provided by the county, I have found several discrepancies between the bid form and plan sheets for the lighting items:

	<u>Bid Form:</u>	<u>Plans:</u>
#715-1-12 Lighting Conductor (F&I) (Insulated No 8 – 6):	36,409 LF	21, 842 LF
#715-4-121 Light Pole Comp. (F&I) (130 MPH) (40'):	35 EA	23 EA
#715-7-11 Load Center (F&I) (Secondary Voltage):	3 EA	2 EA
#715-500-1 Pole Cable Distribution System – Conv:	35 EA	23 EA
#715-500-3 Pole Distribution System – Wall Mntd:	4 EA	2 EA

Then there are pay item(s) in the bid form that are not in the plans as well as pay items in the plans that are not in the bid form:

Pay Item(s) Not in Plans:

#715-4-21 Light Pole Complete – Special Foundation: 2 EA

Pay Item(s) Not in Bid Form:

#630-2-11 Lighting – Conduit (F&I) (Underground): 3,810 LF

#635-2-11 Lighting Pull Box (F&I) (Roadside-Moulded): 37 EA

Can you please provide some clarification for these items?

Response #24: The quantities for each item above as shown on the plans are correct, and the Bid Form has been updated. Pay Item #715-4-21 has been zeroed out on the Bid Form. Pay Items #630-2-11 and 635-2-11 are listed as Bid Items 209 and 220 respectively and the quantities have been updated.

Question #25: I am the local territory manager for ADS, providers of stormwater drainage pipe and related products. I've been asked to provide a quote for our drainage pipe as an alternate to the RCP specified on the Ft Hamer project in Manatee County and would like to confirm that our pipe would be allowed before doing so. I've included some information including our 100 year FDOT approval per Section 948-7. Please let me know if our pipe will be allowed as an alternate at your earliest convenience.

Response #25: Stormwater drainage pipes shall be bid as shown in plans and bid form.

Question #26: Bid Items 59, 60, 61 & 64 – Concrete Block Drainage Structures (site built); Will precast drainage structures be allowed as alternates for these Concrete Block Drainage Structures? Several of these are located in active paved areas and the use of precast structures will speed installation and reduce traffic issues.

Response #26: Precast structures are acceptable.

Question #27: How long is the warranty period?

Response #27: The Warranty Period is three (3) years beginning from the date Substantial Completion is issued. Refer to Article XIII, 13.1 *Representations, Warranties and Covenants* of the General Conditions.

Question #28: Is the Surety's Standard Bid Bond Form for Florida acceptable?

Response #28: Yes.

Question #29: Does the base material need to be FDOT certified material or is locally obtained bank run shell acceptable for the road base for this project?

Response #29: All material shall meet FDOT requirements unless otherwise stated in the Project Special Provisions.

Question #30: Please clarify the testing requirements for the various types of drainage pipe. Will all pipe require video inspection and laser profiling?

Response #30: Please refer to Special Provisions, *Post-Construction Storm Pipe Testing*; Pipe Testing should follow FDOT Specifications, except, Laser Profile is only required for ADS/HDPE stormwater pipes.

Question #31: The bid quantities supplied in xcel format as part of Addendum 1 are identical for the 630 day and 720 day proposals. Will quantities for daily items (traffic control, field office, etc) be adjusted on one form or the other?

Response #31: Bid B quantities have been updated to account for additional days of MOT and Field Office.

Question #32: Will Performance and Payment Bonds be required in the amount of the Total Base Bid or the Total Offer For Bid (includes 10% contingency)?

Response #32: The successful Bidder shall furnish surety bonds for 100% of the total award amount, which will include the contract contingency, in accordance with the provisions listed in Exhibit A, Insurance and Bonding Requirements, of Invitation for Bids #14-3257CD.

Question #33: On one set of plans it tells us to install all the ERM and wire grounding units in the 630-2-11 items (interconnect plans 307-6082660) and on another sets of plans it tells us to install the ERM and Wire grounding units in the Pull Box pay items (323-6054764).

Response #33: This response is based on a review of sheet T-5 in the interconnect/signal plans. The notes in question are complementary. Note 1 provides for the utility locate system (wire and warning tape) for the entire length of conduit, while Note 7 provides for a utility marking system (above ground route markers) for each of the pull boxes.

Question #34: We read the addendum 1 and the response to question # 7 kind of confuse us. Our question is: Does the contractor has to provide any type of inspection or QC during the pile installation? At the pre-bid we understood that the contractor will has to have a QC person monitoring the pile installation together with the County representative.

Response #34: Yes, Please see response from Addendum 1.

Question #35: Bid Form, Pay Item No. 214, FDOT Item No 0633-1-122 "ITS Fiber Optic Cable (F&I), SM, 72 Fiber" has no quantity.

Response #35: Pay Item No. 214 is no longer needed for this project and has been blacked out.

Question #36: Bid drawing B-4, Concrete Materials Note 1 requires corrosion protection for pier columns 4 thru 18 from the top of the footings to 12 feet above MHW. Is corrosion protection required in the footings for these piers?

Response #36: The corrosion protection specified in Note 1 is not required in the footings for those piers.

Question #37 Utility Pay Item 257 – Utility Fixture, Relocate (Surge Valve); There is no information listed in Specification Section 01150 Measurement & Payment for this item. Please provide detail drawings of the 42” Surge Valve & Tank item and details of proposed relocation.

Response #37: Please see the record drawing (detail in the red box) attached to this Addendum #3 that shows what the existing surge relief valve looks like. The plan is for the contractor cut the line and extend it to the R/W line.

Question #38: Please clarify if the bid quantity of 1 SL for Pay Item 130 “Access Ladder & Platform” is should be changed to 1 LS.

Response #38: The unit of measure for Pay Item 130 has been changed to LS.

Question #39: Please clarify if the bid quantity of 0 LF for Pay Item 214 “ITS Fiber Optic Cable (F&I), SM, 72 Fiber” is accurate and what we should use for our bid proposal.

Response #39: Pay Item No. 214 is no longer needed for this project and has been blacked out.

Question #40: Drawings B-53 and B-54 appear to be missing Beam Length Control and Beam Spacing Tables. Please provide these details.

Response #40: Since the baseline on drawings B-53 and B-54 is in a tangent, and the piers are all at 90 degrees to the baseline, the beam lengths and beam spacings can be shown in the framing plan instead of a Table. Please refer to the Framing Plans.

Question #41: Please confirm the Contractors warranty period required for the project.

Response #41: The Warranty Period is three (3) years beginning from the date Substantial Completion is issued. Refer to Article XIII, 13.1 *Representations, Warranties and Covenants* of the General Conditions.

Question #42: Does pay item 37 (0337-7-42) Asphaltic Concrete, Friction Course, Type C, (PG 76-22), include rubber? Note that it is called for in the Fort Hamer Bridge plans, but isn't mentioned on the Upper Manatee River Road or Fort Hamer Road plans.

Response #42: Pay Item 37 (0337-7-42) Asphaltic Concrete, Friction Course, Type C will not include rubber. This mix will be a polymer modified asphalt.

Question #43: For use in performing our earthwork calculations, can existing topography be added to the plans or can CAD files with this data be provided?

Response #43: No, the CAD file will be provided after the contract being awarded. Please perform your earthwork calculations based on cross sections.

Question #44: Due to the narrow widths of road areas being widened will the County accept a premixed stabilizer or additional base equal to the coefficient of the specified stabilizer?

Response #44: Yes, as long as the structure number meets FDOT Index 514 for each group and the LBRs meet Manatee County standard, which is 60.

Question #45: Will the Contractor be required to have miscellaneous metal fabricated by a company with an approved quality control plan per FDOT Standard Specifications?

Response #45: The intent should be to utilize fabricators with FDOT approved quality control plans.

Question #46: Will the Contractor be required to furnish a Level II Concrete Field Technician per FDOT Standard Specifications?

Response #46: Yes.

Question #47: Will the payment for the prestressed concrete piling be based on FDOT Standard Specifications?

Response #47: Payment for prestressed concrete piling will be made per FDOT Standard Specification (2014) section 455.

Question #48: Will Contractor be paid for preformed pile holes per FDOT Standard Specifications?

Response #48: Preformed pile holes specified on Sheet B-15 in the Contract Plans shall be incidental to the associated pay item. Additional preformed holes will be considered contingency quantities and no payment will be made unless otherwise directed and approved in writing by the Owner's Project Representative.

Question #49: Addendum #1, Attachment 6, (NMFS Section 7 letter, page 2) states that the temporary work trestle will be 28' wide. Plan sheet B-4 says that contractor will be responsible for the size and location of the temporary work structures. If necessary, as determined by contractor, can the temporary work trestle be constructed wider than 28'?

Response #49: If the Contractor chooses to use a temporary structure greater in width than 28', a permit modification will need to be sought from SWFWMD and ACOE.

Question #50: Will the Contractor be allowed to construct temporary work structures parallel with pier locations to gain access, if necessary, for pier construction?

Response #50: Only if the temporary work is within the limits identified in the permit package and meets the contract plans requirements. Otherwise, a permit modification will be required.

Question #51: Can EOR provide computation books for the bridge and roadwork for use by the Contractor during the bidding process?

Response #51: No. It is the Contractor's responsibility to perform detail quantity take-offs from the plans to determine actual quantities.

Question #52: Please provide existing pipe size at STA 87+25.63, 42.41'LT. Plans call for a new MES but do not provide size.

Response #52: The pipe size at this location is 12"x18: RCP.

Question #53: Referring to Bid Item 13, FDOT #0104-1, Artificial Coverings. Please tell me where I can find details pertaining to this bid item.

Response #53: Artificial covering item is for as needed during construction and the quantities were estimated for the high embankment areas at the approaches to the bridge. There are no drawing details for this item, refer to FDOT Standard Specifications 104 for further information.

Question #54: The current permits showed limit of the Impact Area Dredge/Fill within the footprints of the footings. Does the Impact Area include necessary work area around footings? For example area for pile driving template, slope excavation 2:1, drive sheet piles, small equipment, etc. Will the Contractor be able to install temporary access necessary to construct permanent structure around each bent?

Response #54: The Impact Area is limited to the footing footprint only. If temporary access is provided to any bent and not included in the permit, a permit modification will be required. It was the designer's intent to access the footing area from the temporary structure.

Question #55: Will Manatee County follow FDOT Standard Specifications for Fuel and Bituminous Adjustment for this project?

Response #55: No. Payment adjustments are included in Division 1 of the FDOT Standard Specs, which are not part of this contract.

Question #56: Reference bid form, Pay Item 247, cannot find the 25LF of 10-inch ductile iron water main to be relocated on the Upper Manatee River Road Utility Adjustment plan sheets, please clarify.

Response #56: There is a possible conflict and relocation of the 10" DI water main is shown on Sheet UAS-2 at Sta. 61+60 on Upper Manatee River Road (UMRR).

Question #57: Reference bid form, Pay Item 256, cannot find the BFP incl. Vacuum Breakers and Exp. Tank on the Upper Manatee River Road Utility Adjustment plan sheets, please clarify.

Response #57: Some water services or components may need to be relocated or replaced, and the plumbing code may require BFP's and vacuum breakers to be installed to bring up to current code as a result, so we requested a bid item price in case this work is needed.

Question #58: Reference bid form, Pay Item 253, the Ft. Hamer Bridge Quantity for this item shows 2-each, I find three (3), please clarify.

Response #58: Concur there are three (3) fire hydrants, bid form has been corrected.

Question #59: Reference bid form, Pay Item 266, Ft. Hamer Road bid quantity shows 290LF, I find 60LF + 170LF + 170LF for a total of 400LF, please clarify.

Response #59: On Sheet UAS-9 at Sta. 108+00 the callout for 8" force main relocation says 170LF, but the plans show the relocation to be approximately 60LF to scale, so the correct amount is 60+170+60=290LF as shown on the bid form. Please note the callout should read 60LF in lieu of 170.

Question #60: Reference bid form, Pay Item 253, Upper Manatee River Road bid quantity shows one (1) each, where is it at? Unable to find on Utility Adjustment plan sheets, please clarify.

Response #60: The hydrant on Sheet UAS-1 at Sta. 45+00 looks like it might need to be relocated so we inserted a bid item for this purpose, in case it is needed.

Question #61: Reference bid form, Pay Item 247, the Ft. Hamer Road bid quantity of 40LF, is this the pipe to be adjusted as shown on plan sheet UAS-3 at approximately station 35+00 at Mulholland Road? If so, what size pipe is it? Please clarify.

Response #61: No. The Ft. Hamer bid quantity for Pay Item 247 of 40LF is for relocating some 6" dia. Hydrant leads as necessary on Sheet UAS-12 at Sta. 137+40.

Question #62: Reference bid form, Pay Item 135, what type handrail are we bidding on for this item? Is the handrail two tier or three to accommodate bicycle traffic?

Response #62: Refer to the 4'-6" rail height on Index 862.

Question #63: Reference bid form, Pay Item 269, Connect to Existing Force Main, what down-time information can the County provide for each force main and what volume of raw sewage will the contractor have to figure on handling for each force main shut down? Will line-stops be necessary to isolate each shut down?

Response #63: The flows in the force mains range from low flows near zero at night to estimated maximum flows as follows: Fort Hamer 16" force main north of Golf Course Road 1750gpm, south of Golf Course Road 715gpm, Upper Manatee River Road (UMRR) 8" force main at 2nd Ave. 500gpm, at 10th Ave. 900gpm, and Greenfield 6" force main 330gpm. The County may be able to shut down some stations if connections are made between Midnight and 5:00am, but the Contractor must be able to handle actual flows using tanker trucks during his connection work. A line stop may be used on the 16" force main north of Golf Course road subject to approval of the methods by the County Utility Operations superintendent. It is anticipated that line stops would not be necessary elsewhere since the Contractor should be able to handle night flows with two or three tanker trucks.

Question #64: Reference bid form, Pay Item 269, Upper Manatee River Road quantity shows two (2), there is an 8-inch force main on plan sheet UAS-1 at station 49+60, the other is a 6-inch on plan sheet UAS-2 at approximately station 60+80. Each of these deflections will require a connection at each end of the deflection, that constitutes two (2) connections per each deflection and the bid quantity should be four (4) instead of two (2)? The bid quantity for Ft. Hamer Road shows eight (8), I find four (4) force main deflections on the Utility Adjustment sheets for Ft. Hamer Road, each deflection will require two (2) connections that constitutes eight (8) connections. Please review.

Response #64: The bid quantity for Pay Item 269 "Connection to Force Main" for UMRR should be four (4), not two (2). The Bid Form has been updated.

Question #65: Reference bid form, Pay Item 263, this bid item requires the ARV Assembly to include a manhole, I do not find a detail for a below grade force main air release in the Manatee County Utility Standards. There is a below grade water main air release detail in the County's Standards, UW-11, but automatic air release valves are not allowed for below grade. Please provide a detail of what we are to provide for Pay Item 263.

Response #65: For Pay Item 263, "ARV Assembly, including manhole, (wastewater)", detail US-10 "Below Grade Air Release Valve for Force Mains" in Manatee County Utility Standards shows the work required.

Question #66: Reference bid form, Pay Item 261, the bid quantity shown for Ft. Hamer Road cannot be right if we have 400LF of 8-inch and 240LF of 16-inch force main to relocate, please review this quantity. Also, why is there no quantity for this item for Upper Manatee River Road?

Response #66: For Pay Item 261 "Grout or Remove Abandoned Pipe", the quantity for Ft. Hamer Road is only 470LF, even though more total linear feet are shown on the plans to be relocated, because this is the expected quantity of force main that will likely need to be grouted or removed. Please note that all force main relocations are shown conservatively as UP TO XX linear feet. Since we do not know the exact vertical or horizontal locations of all force mains, the actual lengths needing to be relocated are likely to be less than the total linear feet shown. There is no quantity for UMRR because the force main locations are very short and it will be necessary to remove the existing force main segments and replace them in approximately the same horizontal locations to complete the work, so no additional pay will be required for grouting or removing them.

Question #67: Please clarify item A.22 in the Instruction to Bidders, are the contractors to include or exclude sales tax on permanent materials?

Response #67: Article A.22 states each party's tax responsibilities. No clarification will be given.

Question #68: S-70 on Sheet 38 of the Fort Hamer Bridge plans is a 36" MES but is tabulated on Sheet 21 as a 30" MES. Shouldn't the pay quantity on Bid Item 116 be change from 3 each to 2 each and the pay quantity for Bid Item 117 increased from 2 each to 3 each?

Response #68: Call out on sheet 38 is correct, bid quantity item 116 should be 2 each and the pay item 117 would be 3 each.

Question #69: MES S-9A on Sheet 22 of the Fort Hamer Bridge plans is Cross Drain Mitered End Section per FDOT Index 272, but it is included in Bid Item 116, MES, Optional Round, RCP, 30" SD and would typically be grated. Is this correct?

Response #69: S-9A is Cross Drain Mitered End Section (FDOT Index 272). Bid form has been updated to include Pay Item No. 106A, 0430-982-133 MES Optional (RCP) 30"/CD.

Question #70: MES S-16 on Sheet 22 of the Fort Hamer Bridge plans is Cross Drain Mitered End Section per FDOT Index 272, but it is included in Bid Item 117, MES, Optional Round, RCP, 36" SD and would typically be grated. Is this correct?

Response #70: S-16 is Cross Drain Mitered End Section (FDOT Index 272). Bid form has been updated to include Pay Item No. 106B, 0430-982-138 MES Optional (RCP) 36"/CD.

Question #71: MES S-118 on Sheet 22 of the Fort Hamer Bridge plans is Cross Drain Mitered End Section per FDOT Index 272, but it is included in Bid Item 117, MES, Optional Round, RCP, 54" SD and would typically be grated. Is this correct?

Response #71: S-118 is Side Drain Mitered End Section including grate (FDOT Index 273).

Question #72: The Fort Hamer Roadway plans show construction of numerous endwalls per FDOT 250. FDOT 250 endwalls are paid for in the contract unit price for Class I Concrete (endwalls). Pay Item 39, Class I Concrete does not include any quantities for the Fort Hamer Roadway project. Please clarify.

Response #72: Endwalls on Fort Hamer Road project are included on pay item # 41 Enwalls class II. Please see your bid form.

Question #73: The cross sections in the Fort Hamer Roadway plans and Upper Manatee River Road plans do not show any subsoil excavation and neither do the cross section quantity tabulations. Yet, both projects include quantities in Pay Item 25, Subsoil Excavation. Where is the subsoil excavation located on both projects? Are these quantities just allowances for over-excavation in addition to the regular excavation and would include the cost of the backfill up to grade/subgrade?

Response #73: Subsoil excavation is included in case that the removal of unsuitable material is needed. The cost of the subsoil excavation includes the cost of the backfill up to the finished grading template.

Question #74: Reference bid form, Pay Item 261, the bid quantity shown for Ft. Hamer Road cannot be right if we have 400LF of 8-inch and 240LF of 16-inch force main to relocate, please review this quantity. Also, why is there no quantity for this item for Upper Manatee River Road?

Response #74: For Pay Item 261 "Grout or Remove Abandoned Pipe", the quantity for Ft. Hamer Road is only 470LF, even though more total linear feet are shown on the plans to be relocated, because this is the expected quantity of force main that will likely need to be grouted or removed. Please note that all force main relocations are shown conservatively as UP TO XX linear feet. Since we do not know the exact vertical or horizontal locations of all force mains, the actual lengths needing to be relocated are likely to be less than the total linear feet shown. There is no quantity for UMRR because the force main locations are very short and it will be necessary to remove the existing force main segments and replace them in approximately the same horizontal locations to complete the work, so no additional pay will be required for grouting or removing them.

Question #75: Reference bid form, Pay Item 27, Clean Sand, does the County have a specification for this material? If so, please provide.

Response #75: Please refer to FDOT Spec. 902-4 under "Filter Material for underdrains".

Question #76: Reference bid form, Pay Item 38, Miscellaneous Asphalt Pavement, the bid form shows all of this to be going in at the bridge, what about miscellaneous asphalt beneath guardrails on Upper Manatee River Road and Ft. Hamer Road, shouldn't there be some at those areas as well? Please review.

Response #76: The bid form quantity (Pay Item 38) was revised to show 5 tons of miscellaneous asphalt pavement.

Question #77: Reference bid form, Pay Item 62, Junction Box/Conflict Box, the bid quantity for this item shows two (2) on Upper Manatee River Road, I cannot find them, please clarify.

Response #77: The junction boxes/conflict boxes are included in the bid form quantity for eventual conflicts that may occur during construction between the 42" WM and the storm drains due to very tight space.

Question #78: Reference bid form, Pay Item 83, A2000, 15"/SD, bid quantity shows 658LF, Upper Manatee River Road plan sheet 21B shows 674LF, please review.

Response #78: Per FDOT indexes 272 and 273, and detail sheet # 35 the bid quantity for the pipe has deducted the F value from the total length shown in sheet 21B.

Question #79: Reference bid form, Pay Item 85, A2000, 18"/SD, bid quantity shows 639LF, Upper Manatee River Road plan sheet 21B shows 850LF, please review.

Response #79: Sheet 21B should show 675 LF not 850 LF since P-7A should be 18" RCP instead of 18" A2000. See revised sheet 21 B. Meanwhile, per FDOT indexes 272 and 273 and detail sheet # 35 the bid quantity for the pipe has deducted the F value from the total length shown in sheet 21B.

Question #80: Reference bid form, Pay Item 88, A2000, 24"/SD, bid quantity shows 761LF, Upper Manatee River Road plan sheet 21B shows 849LF, please review.

Response #80: Per FDOT indexes 272 and 273 and detail sheet # 35 the bid quantity for the pipe has deducted the F value from the total length shown in sheet 21B.

Question #81: Reference bid form, Pay Item 95, 14"x23" /SD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 245LF, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows 311LF, please review.

Response #81: The bid form quantity was revised to show 311LF 14"x23"/SD (ERCP). Per FDOT indexes 272 and 273, and detail sheet # 35 the bid quantity for the pipe has deducted the F value from the total length shown in sheet 21B.

Question #82: Reference bid form, Pay Item 99, (RCP) 18"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 471LF, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows 6LF, please review.

Response #82: The bid form quantity was revised to show 6 LF 18"/CD (RCP).

Question #83: Reference bid form, Pay Item 86, (RCP) 18"/SD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows zero -0- footage, plan sheet 21B shows 225LF, please review.

Response #83: The bid form quantity was revised to show 400 LF 18"/SD (RCP).

Question #84: Reference bid form, Pay Item 97, (ERCP) 24"x38"/SD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows zero -0- footage, plan sheet 21B, pipe no. P-29 shows 38 LF, please review.

Response #84: The bid form quantity was revised to show 44 LF 24"x 38"/SD (ERCP). Per FDOT indexes 272 and 273 and detail sheet # 35 the bid quantity for the pipe has deducted the F value from the total length shown in sheet 21B.

Question #85: Reference bid form, Pay Item 100, (ERCP) 12"x18"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 117LF, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows 10LF, please review.

Response #85: The bid form quantity was revised to show 10 LF 12"x18"/CD (RCP).

Question #86: Reference bid form, Pay Item 94, (ERCP) 12"X18"/SD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows zero -0- footage, plan sheet 21B, pipe no. P21 shows 112 LF, please review.

Response #86: The bid form quantity was revised to show 104 LF 12"x18"/SD (RCP). Per FDOT indexes 272 and 273 and detail sheet # 35 the bid quantity for the pipe has deducted the F value from the total length shown in sheet 21B.

Question #87: Reference bid form, Pay Item 102, (ERCP) 24"x38"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 111LF, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows 57LF, please review.

Response #87: The bid form quantity was revised to show 57 LF 24"x38"/CD (ERCP).

Question #88: Reference bid form, Pay Item 106, (RCP) 18"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 2Each, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows zero (-0-), please review.

Response #88: The bid form quantity was revised to show zero (0) MES 18"/CD (RCP). In addition, pay item 112 was revised to show 4 MES 18"/SD (RCP).

Question #89: Reference bid form, Pay Item 107, (ERCP) 12"x18"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 1Each, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows zero (-0-), please review.

Response #89: The bid form quantity was revised to show zero (0) MES 12x18"/CD (ERCP).

Question #90: Reference bid form, Pay Item 108, (ERCP) 14"x23"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 1Each, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows zero (-0-), please review.

Response #90: The bid form quantity was revised to show zero (0) MES 14x23"/CD (ERCP).

Question #91: Reference bid form, Pay Item 109, (ERCP) 24"x38"/CD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 2Each, U.M.R.R. plan sheet 21B shows zero (-0-), please review. If structure no. S-44A is considered these two (2) miters, then they should be designated as Side Drain Miters, (SD), not CD and should be paid as one (1) Double 24"x38" miter and not two (2). That is how the F.D.O.T. would do it.

Response #91: Per FDOT indexes 272 and 273, MES shall be paid based on each independent pipe end.

Question #92: Reference bid form, Pay Item 111, (RCP) 15"/SD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 4 Each, found two (2), Nos. S-32 and S-33, where are the other two (2)?

Response #92: The bid form quantity was revised to show two (2) MES 15"/SD (RCP).

Question #93: Reference bid form, Pay Item 113, A2000 18"/SD, bid form quantity for U.M.R.R. shows 2Each, found four (4), please revise bid quantity.

Response #93: The bid form quantity was revised to show four (4) MES A2000 18"/SD.

Question #94: Reference bid form, Pay Item 123, (ERCP) 29"x45"/SD, here again this is not a Side Drain miter, it is a Cross Drain miter and its structure no. S-27. Please provide the appropriate cross drain bid item, the 29"x45" ERCP pipe is properly called out as a Cross Drain.

Response #94: The pipe doesn't cross the road; it is counted as a side drain.

Question #95: Also on the Bridge Work Conduit that is going in the Barrier wall for the Fiber Interconnect, the plans do not reference how often we install a junction box or the size of the junction box for the power, lighting, or spare conduit. Each barrier wall shows us installing 2-2" conduits being installed.

January 15, 2015

Response #95: All embedded conduit and junction boxes for Fiber Optic Cable/Spare Conduit shall be installed as per Index 21210. The EJB's shall be 24"L x 18"W x 6"D, NEMA 4X Non-Metallic, installed with cover access in the pedestrian path. Separate EJB's are required for the Fiber Optic and Spare Conduit and shall have a maximum spacing of 1,250 feet. All conduits shall terminate within the EJB's using bushings or bell ends. The spare conduit shall have polypropylene cord installed and secured for future use.

Question #96: Also are we going to be able to install both conduit in the barrier wall in the same box? Or do we need to have a different box for the fiber interconnect and the spare conduit?

Response #96: See response to #95 above.

Question #97: Same question for the lighting conduits and Navigation lights conduit.

Response #97: Separate junction boxes should be used for the roadway lighting and navigational lighting conduit. The size of the junction boxes should be per FDOT Standard Index 21210. The spacing of the junction boxes should be per the Contract Plans, Specifications and other referenced documents such as the FDOT Design Standard Indexes.

END OF ADDENDUM #3

Bids will be received at Manatee County Purchasing, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Bradenton, Florida 34205 until **Friday, January 23, 2015 at 3:00 PM.**

Sincerely,



Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO for
Purchasing Official