

# MEMORANDUM

To: All Interested Bidders  
Date: April 2, 2015  
Subject: Invitation for Bid #15-0465-0V  
53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West, 43<sup>rd</sup> Street West to 75<sup>th</sup> Street West,  
Roadway, Striping & Signal Work (Project#383-6082960)  
Force Main 27-A, from 51<sup>st</sup> Street West to the Southwest  
Water Reclamation Facility (SWWRF) Including Reclaimed  
Water and Potable Water (Project#406-608298 /  
ADDENDUM #4



---

**Bidders are hereby notified that this Addendum shall be acknowledged on page 00300-1 of the Bid Form and made a part of the above named bidding and contract documents. Bids submitted without Acknowledgement 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 document, 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.

**The deadline to submit all inquiries concerning interpretation, clarification or additional information pertaining was March 5, 2015 at 5:00 pm.** This deadline has been established to maintain fair treatment for all potential bidders, while maintaining the expedited nature of the Economic Stimulus that the contracting of this work may achieve.

**Bidders Note 1:** Clarification to Addendum #3 responses:

1. Bid Opening Remains Unchanged:  
**April 10, 2015 at 3:00 PM**

**Bidders Note 2:** Revised Interactive Bid Forms (Bid A & B): (28 total pages)  
Addendum #4.

**Roadway and Drainage Bid Items:**

1. Bid Quantity for Line Item # 31 has been revised from 26 LF TO 56 LF.
2. Bid Quantity for Line Item # 32 has been revised from 73 LF TO 80 LF.
3. Bid Quantity for Line Item # 33 has been revised from 167 LF TO 147 LF.

Financial Management  
Purchasing Division  
1112 Manatee Ave W Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205  
Phone number: (941)749-3014

### **Clarification for Roadway and Drainage:**

**Question 1:** The answer to question #2 remains confusing and needs additional explanation. Is the note on plan sheet #65 regarding the well mislabeled? Are we to plug the well 200' to the south as referenced or not? If so, we still need the necessary information (size, depth, permits). If we are not to plug a well, are we simply to relocate the farm riser at this location?

**Response 1:** Disregard note on plan sheet #85 which reads "Contractor to plug ex. well". The only work required is to relocate the farm irrigation riser approximately 40 feet to the south. The final location of the relocated farm riser will be adjacent to the top of the bank of the relocated agricultural ditch (Sta. 73+67, 123' Rt.).

**Question 2:** Response 7 of Addendum #3, plans show 164LF, less 8LF per each side drain mitered end, there are two (2) side drain mitered ends therefore 16LF subtracted from 164LF equals 148LF, bid form shows 22LF, where are the rest of the mitered end sections? Please review.

**Response 2:** The only 15" side drain is located at Sta.92 + 80 Rt.  $16LF \times 2 = 32LF - 8 - 8 = 16LF$ . The Bid quantity for Bid Item #30, is 22LF and shall remain unchanged. This quantity allows for any field adjustments.

**Question 3:** Response 8 of Addendum #3, plans show 56LF, less 15LF per each side drain mitered end, there is one (1) mitered end therefore 15LF subtracted from 56LF equals 41LF, bid form shows 26LF, where is the other mitered end section?

**Response 3:** The only 36" RCP side drain is located at Sta. 113 + 74 Rt. Due to the 7' drop in grade, the MES shall be constructed at Sta. 113 + 59 Rt. Length =  $71' - 15' = 56LF$ . The Bid quantity for Bid Item #31 has been revised from 26LF to 56LF.

**Question 4:** Response 9 of Addendum #3, plans show 168LF, less 17LF per each side drain miter at 4:1 slope, there are six (6) of them, therefore 102LF subtracted from 168LF equals 66LF, bid form shows 73LF.

**Response 4:** The only 42" RCP side drain is located at Sta. 55 + 00 Rt. ( $56LF - 17 - 17 = 22LF$ ); Sta.61 + 30 Rt. ( $48LF - 20 = 28LF$ ) and Sta. 74 + 00 ( $64LF - 17 - 17 = 30LF$ ). Please note that at Sta. 61 + 30 Rt., MES is to be constructed at 2:1 slope. This allowable since we are outside the clear zone. Each MES = 10LF. The Bid quantity for Bid Item #32 has been revised from 73 LF to 80LF.

April 2, 2015

**ADDENDUM #4**

**Page 3 of 5**

Invitation for Bid #15-0465-OV

**Question 5:** Response 10 of Addendum #3, plans show 24LF, bid form shows 167LF, where is the rest of this pipe?

**Response 5:** Please note that the Bid Item for pipe cross drain culvert (A2000, PVC) 15" also applied to pipe storm sewer culvert (A2000, PVC) 15" per FDOT Basis of Estimate.

The 15" A2000 pipe cross drain/storm sewer is located at Sta. 74 + 00 Rt. (48 LF); Sta. 87 + 40 Rt. (24LF - 5 = 19LF) and Sta. 137 + 30 Rt. (80LF). The Bid quantity for Bid Item #33 has been revised from 167LF to 147LF.

**Question 6:** Response 12 of Addendum #3, plans show 838LF, less 11LF per each cross drain miter, there is one (1) A-2000 miter, therefore 11LF subtracted from 838LF equals 827LF, where are the other A-2000 mitered ends?

**Response 6:** The pipe storm sewer culvert (A2000, PVC) (24") is located at Sta. 87 + 76 Rt. (24LF - 11 = 13LF); Sta. 125 + 00 to 132 + 00 = 700LF; at Pond (50LF - 11 = 39LF). The sum is 752LF. The Bid quantity for Bid Item #38 is 765LF and shall remain unchanged. This quantity allows for any field adjustments.

**Question 7:** Response 40 of Addendum #3, the response issued in Response No. 2, Roadway and Drainage does not tell us anything about the well, just an irrigation riser, is the well not to be abandoned? If there is a well to be abandoned we need to know size and depth of the well, please provide.

**Response 7:** See Response #1 under Clarification for Roadway and Drainage.

**Question 8:** Bid Item 22 for the Class I Concrete Agricultural crossing at sta. 61+00, the quantity of 23.70 CY appears to be correct for a 4" thick pad. The plans and detail calls for a 6" thick pad. Please verify the thickness required for the concrete pad and the quantity on the bid form.

**Response 8:** The agricultural crossing at sta. 61+30 is measured from edge of pavement to edge of pavement. The length = 80'; Width = 16'; thickness = 0.5';  $80' \times 16' \times 0.5' = 640 \text{ CF}$  or 23.7 CY. The Bid quantity for Bid Item 22 is 27.30 CY and is correct.

**Question 9:** Reference bid form, Line No. 13, what type of geosynthetic reinforcement are we to bid for this item? I do not find any reference in Universal Engineer's report that speaks to this being necessary. F.D.O.T. Index 501 is quite lengthy with a lot of different options for slope reinforcement, what are we bidding on?

**Response 9:** Per FDOT Index 501, the only approved fabric for this application is Mirafi Miramesh GR or Tencate Mmesh GR/SG.

**End Clarification for Roadway and Drainage.**

April 2, 2015

**ADDENDUM #4**

**Page 4 of 5**

Invitation for Bid #15-0465-OV

**Clarification to Utilities (Force Main, Reclaimed Water and Potable Water):**

**Question 1:** Response 33 and 48, grout filling the abandoned pipes as “directed by the County” does not help us at this time to quantify our costs. We need to know which pipes are to be grouted and from where to where, station to station. As several locations to expose the pipe will be necessary, each location will require dewatering, crew time, concrete pump sub-contractor and necessary fittings. Please furnish information about which pipes are to be grouted and stations to grout from and to.

**Response 1: For the purpose of pricing grout fill of abandoned mains, the contractor should assume all pipes mentioned in response 33 and 48 are grouted full except the existing 30” force main.**

**Question 2:** We must know if the existing 20” pipe to be tapped with an 18” TS&V is DIP or CIP. We do not feel comfortable with tapping a CIP with this size combination as the pipe integrity may be negatively compromised. Please confirm pipe type so we can decide how we will proceed with our bid.

**Response 2: The County believes the existing 20” City of Longboat Key Force Main to be Ductile Iron Pipe and not Cast Iron Pipe. Bidders should bid accordingly.**

**Question 3:** We believe the design of the deadman thrust block by a PE should be removed from this contract and become the responsibility of the design PE for this project. Several engineers we have contacted have declined pricing this at this time due to too many unknowns. The engineers for this project have availability to more information than any other and should handle this design for the successful contractor and negotiated accordingly. If no outside engineer will be willing to take on this responsibility it may force a contractor into a “No Bid” situation.

**Response 3: Bidders shall reference Response 13, page 13 of Addendum #3 which was provided previously under Responses to Force Main, Reclaimed Water and Potable.**

**End Clarification to Utilities (Force Main, Reclaimed Water and Potable):**

April 2, 2015  
**ADDENDUM #4**  
**Page 5 of 5**

Invitation for Bid #15-0465-OV

If you have submitted a bid prior to receiving this addendum, you may request in writing that your original sealed bid be returned to your firm. All sealed bids received will be opened on the date stated.

Bids will be received at Manatee County Purchasing Division, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205 on **April 10, 2015 at 3:00 PM.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Melissa M. Wendel", followed by a horizontal line and the word "for" written in cursive.

Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO, Purchasing Official  
Manatee County Purchasing Division

Ov

**Attachments:**

28 pages Interactive Excel Bid Forms (Bid A and B), titled Addendum #4