



Delaware Department
of Transportation

CONTRACT NO. T200510602.01

I-95 & US 202 INTERCHANGE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**** F I N A L P O S T E D D A T E ****

August 30, 2011

Note: Be sure you enter the above date where required on your Certification page!

Question 121:

Will the root mat and the pavement removal shown on the earthwork summary on plan sheet 6 be wasted on site also as noted under excavation available for embankment on the same plan sheet 6? Why is the root mat not part of the item 202000 item?

Response to Question 121:

Refer to Section 201 for root mat measurement and disposal requirements. Refer to Section 202.05 for placement of waste pavement materials in embankments.

Question 120:

Will any consideration be given to extend this bid date due to the effects of hurricane Irene such as computers and phone outages?

You have changed a total of 32 plan changes which took DelDOT months to do. Why is the contractor (*not*) given a sufficient time extension to review these changes and have the bid date at least postponed until 09/06/2011?

Response to Question 120:

The Department has considered whether an extension is warranted, and has decided the bid date will not be extended.

Question 119:

With the receipt of add #4 we have noticed the following:

- A. There is no special provision 602648 included with the addendum.
- B. You deleted special provision 602650 however there are no pages to replace the ones that are deleted with this special provision.

Response to Question 119:

Please refer to page 107 of the specifications. Items 602648 and 602650 are both listed on the same special provision. Therefore, the special provision did not change, the bid item changed.

Question 118:

Addendum #4 changed the quantity in the Schedule of Items for Line No. 0820, Item 608000 Coarse Aggregate for Foundation Stabilization and Subfoundation Backfill from 65 TONS to 169 TONS. 65 TONS is tabulated on Plan Sheet No. 259 (Structural Arch Sht. 2 of 2) and there have been no addendum revisions to the quantity for the Arch or any other structures on this project. Please identify the location where this change has occurred.

Response to Question 118:

The other quantities of 608000 are located under the stub abutments for Bridges 1-764 and 1-763. Each abutment has a 1'-0" thick layer. The quantity lists for these bridges were updated to include the coarse aggregate as part of Addendum #4.

Question 117:

What type stone is needed for the Ultra-Thin pavement mix design? Is it 4.75 mm, 9.5 mm or 12.5 mm stone?

Response to Question 117:

Please use 4.75mm stone.

Question 116:

Please clarify Note 19 on Plan Sheet No. 169 (S2-1) by indicating whether or not the Contractor will be paid under Item No. 602579, Drilling Holes and Installing Dowels, if Mechanical Couplers (as permitted) are opted to be installed by the Contractor in lieu of lap splices.

Response to Question 116:

As shown in the plans and described in notes, the abutment construction for Bridge 1-762 is phased, and we are allowing the contractor to decide whether to use mechanical couplers or drill holes. Mechanical couplers, if selected, will be incidental to item 604000 – Bar Reinforcement, Epoxy Coated. If the Contractor chooses to drill holes, they will be paid for under item 602579 – Drilling Holes and Installing Dowels. Payment is only made for work performed, so if holes are not drilled, no payment will be made for item 602579. The Contractor should bid the project as he/she intends to construct it.

Question 115:

As a follow-up to the response given to Question 98, please advise as to the required embedment of the top of the piles, into the abutments for Bridge Nos. BR 1-763 and BR 1-764.

Response to Question 115:

The top of the piles shall be embedded 1' into the abutment.

Question 114:

Item 401577 Paver-Laid Ultrathin Hot Mix. There are 3 types of Ultrathin Hot Mix, they have differing gradations of aggregate for each; What type is required for this project? I cannot find it called out anywhere in the specifications.

Response to Question 114:

Please see answer to Question 56.

Question 113:

Based on the overall height of the truss with Flanges for SO 1035 & SO 1036, we anticipate a problem thermal expansion during the Hot Dip Galvanizing process. Would alternate designs be allowed?

Response to Question 113:

We will consider alternate designs, although there are no guarantees that they will be accepted and any time delays will be at the Contractor's expense. Any alternate designs must be well documented as outlined in Section 105 of the Standard Specifications.

August 22, 2011

Question 112:

The answer for question #92 contradicts the boring information that was provided to us. Can the department re-evaluate the boring information with respect to MSE walls 2 & 3 to clarify how the existing rock layer will affect the excavation for these MSE Walls?

Response to Question 112:

The MSE Walls will be constructed as described in the plans and specs. Any rock that is encountered and requires removal will be paid for under item 206500 – Rock Excavation for Structures and Trenches, although this should be minimal.

Question 111:

Part 2 of Question 90, requests a drainage inlet schedule of the unit tops, but the answer only refers the contractor to the Standard Construction Details. I believe the question is requesting a schedule detailing what inlet top unit from the construction details (Type A, B, C, D, & E) is required for each individual structure. Please provide this schedule so that the top units can be priced out accordingly.

Response to Question 111:

Please see Standard Detail D-5, Sheet 3 and refer to "Inlet Top Unit Applications Chart". As an example, On Sheet 46 DI 137 is along Curb 100, which is a PCC Curb, Type 3. Therefore, according to the chart, Type C Top Unit would be used for DI 137.

Question 110:

Standard Specification 206.03 says that excavated rock shall be used in forming embankments wherever the depth of fill is sufficient to properly contain the rock in accordance with Section 202. Project Note 12 on Plan Sheet No. 4 (N1) says that rock from within the project limits is suitable for use in the embankment slopes when constructed in accordance with Section 202.05 of the Specifications. The Earthwork Summary on Plan Sheet No. 6 (N3) says "all excavation from project to be spoil" and "material from phase 1 to be wasted offsite" and the quantities of Excavation Available for Embankment are all zero (except for 337 CY to construct temporary pavement in Phase 2).

Please advise if rock which is constructed in accordance with Section 202.05 is or is not allowed to be used in embankments.

Response to Question 110:

Rock which is constructed in accordance with Section 202.05 is allowed to be used in embankments. However, it is currently assumed because of the availability of stockpiling locations that no excavated material will be available for reuse. If the contractor wants to stockpile offsite and bring back onto the project it is his option.

Question 109:

Question 78 response (Details for bid item no. 1480. 720529 P.C.C. Safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face) “see standard construction details for 42” high barrier”

The only s.c.d. for 42” high barrier I could find is B-14 (2009) for double face not single face barrier. Can you provide the appropriate detail specific to this project’s requirements ? (Is it possible that the “typical outside shoulder installation” detail on drawing. 157 is for 720529 ?)

Response to Question 109:

Item 720550 – PCC Barrier, Modified, will be replaced via addendum by item 720529 – PCC Safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face.

Question 108:

Question 35 Response: “... and item 715000 will be added to the bid proposal with a quantity of 565 LF”; DWG. 157, NOTE 2. “...TO BE PAID UNDER PERFORATED PIPE UNDERDRAINS, 4” (ITEM 715000)”; & DWG. 7 to 32, LEGEND “Z. ITEM 720529 – SAFETY BARRIER, PERMANENT, SINGLE FACE”

(A) Will all 4”dia. perforated underdrain associated with the barriers be paid under item 715000 ?

(B) Is the DE. 57 aggregate & geotextile to be considered incidental to the barrier or incidental to the underdrain ?

Response to Question 108:

All 4” perforated underdrain, DE 57 stone and geotextile fabric associated with PCC Safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face will be incidental to item 720529. Notes will be clarified via addendum.

Question 107:

Drawing 7 to 32 Typical Sections; & Standard Details P-1

The typical sections indicate dowels to be installed along the longitudinal joint between existing concrete & proposed concrete pavement, while the standard details indicate tie bars (dowels are 1.25” or 1.5”dia., while tie bars are 0.625”dia.). Is it the intent to install dowels as indicated on the typical sections, instead of tie bars as shown on the standard details ?

Response to Question 107:

Install 30” long, 5/8” tie bars to be spaced as per Standard Construction Detail P-1.

Question 106:

Sawcut & sealing of the bituminous overlay for reflective seams in concrete pavement

(a) Will sawcut & sealing of the bituminous overlay above the existing & proposed concrete pavement joints be required ? (i.e.: reflective Cracking) (B) If it is required, how will this be paid ?

Response to Question 106:

Sawcut and sealing of hot-mix overlay is not required.

Question 105:

Drawing 7 to 32 Typical Sections, Legend “H. Item 760508 – Profile Milling, Hot Mix”. Is bid item 2730. 760507 – profile milling, hot mix to be used for for legend “H” quantities ?

Response to Question 105:

Legend H on the Typical Section sheets should refer to item number 760507 – Profile Milling, Hot-Mix

Question 104:

Question #88 requested the bid item in which the pavement removal for ramps 3, 5, & 7 can be found, but the response only described the existing material at Ramp 5. Please advise how the contractor will be paid for the removal of existing Ramps 3, 5, & 7.

Response to Question 104:

P.C.C. Pavement removal is via Item 758000. Flexible Pavement removal is via 202000. Ramp 5 Existing Pavement is found on the Typical Sections. All existing ramp pavements generally consist of 8" Compacted Select Borrow Excavation (top 4" is Cement Stabilized), 10" Reinforced Cement Concrete Pavement, and a 2.5"-5" variable depth Hot-mix overlay.

August 15, 2011

Question 103:

Why was the above referenced project (I-95 O/US 202) removed from the website? This doesn't bid until the 25th.

Response to Question 103:

The project does not appear on the Website when the project documents are being updated. When this occurs, it should not be for more than one hour at a time. Please continue to check the Website for its return.

Question 102:

Please verify the surface elevation of 229.6 which is indicated on the boring logs for Boring No. B-10 at BR 1-763. Plan Sheet No. 143 (CP7) of the Contour and Grading Plans, indicates an elevation of approx. 225.6 in the area of B-10.

Response to Question 102:

The plans are to be considered more accurate than the boring logs. Please note the boring logs are for informational purposes only.

Question 101:

How will rock encountered during the drilling for caissons (Bid items #618526 & 749516 - 749519) be measured and paid?

Response to Question 101:

All rock excavation for the sign structures foundations shall be paid for under item 206500 – Rock Excavation for Structures and Trenches.

Question 100:

How will bulk rock excavation for the MSE walls be measured and paid?

Response to Question 100:

Given the depths to rock at the MSE Wall locations, there should be minimal if any rock excavation. However, if rock is encountered, it would be paid for under item 206500 – Rock Excavation for Structures and Trenches.

Question 99:

Bridge Plan S3-3 (Sheet No. 212) indicates Bottom of Footing Elevations (BFE) for the abutments that are different than those indicated on S3-7 and S3-8 (Sheet Nos. 216 & 217); what are the correct elevations to be used?

Response to Question 99:

The bottom of footing elevations on Sheets 216 and 217 are the correct elevations.

Question 98:

What is the required embedment of piles at the abutments for Bridges Nos. BR 1-763 and BR 1-764?

Response to Question 98:

Piles are to be driven to absolute refusal or 10 feet below the bottom of the MSE Wall, whichever is deeper.

Question 97:

Gross discrepancies between the Station and/or Offset of numerous borings which are depicted and listed in the chart on the Bridge Plans and the boring logs posted on the website have been noticed. For example, Boring B-31 at BR 1-762 is shown on Bridge Plan S2-2 (Sheet No. 170) as being 57'L but on the boring log and in the summary it is shown as being 27'L; Boring B-4 at BR 1-763 is shown on Bridge Plan S3-2 (Sheet No. 211) as being at Sta. 53+57.48 and Offset 22.00' Lt. but on the boring log it is shown as being at Sta. 53+70 and Offset 4' Lt. There are seven (7) borings at BR 1-762 and nine (9) borings at BR 1-763 that have discrepancies. There are six (6) borings at BR 1-764 that have minor discrepancies and are not of concern.

A) Which of the two locations are correct, plans or boring logs?

B) Boring Nos. B-2, B-3 & B-6 at BR 1-763 and B-4 & B-5 at BR 1-764 are missing from the boring logs provided; do they exist and will DelDOT provide them?

Response to Question 97:

A) The locations shown on the plans are correct.

B) We have handwritten boring logs for the missing borings that will be made available to the Contractors. Please note, all boring information is for informational purposes only.

Question 96:

The boring information that was supplied did not include borings SS 1-1, SS 1-2, and SS 9-1. Please provide the boring information for these locations.

Response to Question 96:

Borings SS 1-1 and SS 1-2 were drilled in locations that ultimately did not receive sign structures in the final design. Because they were not used in the design of any of these structures, they were omitted from the available information. Boring SS 9-1 was requested but never drilled. As such, there is no available information for this boring.

Question 95:

On page 181 of special provision #618526 (Drilled Shaft Foundations), note N of the Submittal section states that the contractor shall submit "Details of the Pile Integrity Testing Plan. See Pile Integrity Testing of Drilled Shaft Foundation included in the Contract Documents."

Please advise as to where in the contract documents this information can be found.

Response to Question 95:

Section N of the Special Provision for Item 618526 is not applicable to this project. Pile integrity testing of the drilled shaft foundations for the sign structures is not required.

Question 94:

Please further clarify the response to Question 66 by providing a typical section at Pier 2 showing dimensions of the thickened concrete slab, similar to that shown in "Typical Section Piers 1 & 3" on Drawing Sheet No. 246 (S1-18).

Response to Question 94:

The pier 2 detail erroneously includes shear studs on top of the diaphragm. The beams and deck are continuous over Pier 2, so there is no thickened concrete slab nor shear studs at this location.

Question 93:

Is anti-graffiti required on the proposed MSE Walls? If so, where can the information be found?

Response to Question 93:

No. Anti-graffiti coating is not required on the MSE Walls.

Question 92:

The contract plans and cross sections do not indicate rock at MSE walls 2 and 3 locations; however the boring logs indicate rock. If rock does in fact exist in the MSE wall 2 and 3 location will the removal of the rock and backfill with suitable material be incidental to the MSE wall or be paid as rock excavation and the backfill under the borrow item?

Response to Question 92:

The rock layers are substantially lower than the proposed grade of the bottom of the MSE Walls and should not be encountered during excavation.

Question 91:

In the Department's response to question #37, it is stated that "panels are required to have fabric as shown in the MSE Special Provision." The Special Provisions do not specify the type of geotextile fabric that will be required. Please advise as to the type of geotextile fabric will be required.

Response to Question 91:

The geotextile fabric shall meet the filtration requirements of AASHTO M288. The adhesive to stick the fabric to the panels shall be as per the MSE Wall manufacturer's recommendation.

Question 90:

- 1) Please provide a completed drainage structure schedule with top of grates and invert elevations.
- 2) Please provide a completed drainage inlet schedule and include the appropriate Inlet top unit type in the schedule.

Response to Question 90:

- 1) Drainage Inlet Schedules with top of grates and invert elevations are found in the Construction Plans.
- 2) Inlet top units types are found in D-5 of the DelDOT Standard Construction Details.

Question 89:

Please see page 25 of 36 of the plans for this project. Your plans call for 26.00 x .750 pipe for post material, these sizes alone cannot be found domestically. As for the other sizes listed in your chart, all of the .750 wall material is being priced to me as seamless pipe. This is very expensive pipe, so do you want to stay with these sizes?

Response to Question 89:

We have had no problems on recent installations using similar sizes and have heard of no problems when inquiring throughout the industry. Please bid the project as specified on the plans and in the specifications.

Question 88:

Please advise as to what bid item includes the removal of existing pavement ramps 3, 5, & 7?

Response to Question 88:

P.C.C. Pavement removal is via Item 758000. Flexible Pavement removal is via 202000. Ramp 5 Existing Pavement is found on the Typical Sections. All existing ramp pavements generally consist of 8" Compacted Select Borrow Excavation (top 4" is Cement Stabilized), 10" Reinforced Cement Concrete Pavement, and a 2.5"-5" variable depth Hot-mix overlay.

August 9, 2011

Question 87:

When will Addendum #2 and the remaining questions and answers be posted?

Response to Question 87:

Refer to response to Question 83.

Question 86:

Addendum 1 provided the boring information for this project, but did not provide a geotechnical report. Will a geotechnical report be provided for this project?

Response to Question 86:

A geotechnical report will not be provided

Question 85:

The boring information posted to your website this morning included the borings for the bridge structures and sign structures, but did not include the roadway borings. Please provide the roadway borings as well.

Response to Question 85:

Roadway boring locations are shown in the Soil Boring Schedules provided on the Construction Plan sheets. Roadway boring profiles with soil/rock classifications are shown on the Profile sheets.

Question 84:

The special provision page for item 720540, delineators, is vague in describing the device. While it does refer back to the Delaware MUTCD, it does not indicate if the intent is to use these delineators in a permanent or temporary capacity. In the plans, on sheet 438 of 482, note 11 indicates that these delineators should be installed "per section 3D of the DeIDOT MUTCD," however, Section 3D does not give guidance with regard to delineators. Are the delineators permanent or temporary? Where shall I look for guidance for the design and application of these devices since the indicated section of the DeIDOT MUTCD does not provide such information?

Response to Question 84:

Delineators are a permanent installation and shall be post or barrier mounted.

Question 83:

This project is scheduled to bid one week from tomorrow (8/3). To date, questions and answers have not been posted and no addendum past #1 has been posted. When do expect the Q&A to be posted? When do you expect any additional addenda to be issued? Do you anticipate a further postponement of the bid?

Response to Question 83:

Questions and Answers were posted on 8/8 and 8/9/11. We are expecting an Addendum to be issued sometime during the week of August 8, 2011. The addendum will address the Questions and Answers that have been posted to date, and the addition of one note on a Plan Sheet we will identify when the Addendum is issued. We will be extending the bid date.

Question 82:

Are the plans, for T200510602, that are posted on the website sufficient for use if I am a supplier bidding to a general contractor or do I have to purchase the plans? If not, I would like to know what the cost of the plans & proposal for project T200510602.01 I-95 & US 202 Interchange, New Castle County and how I go about ordering.

Response to Question 82:

Yes, the plans on the website are sufficient for use for your purposes, however, you still need to review all addendums and Questions and Answers to be sure you have the complete information. As a supplier you are not required to be listed as a planholder. Please refer to the advertisement for this project for further information regarding requesting plans and specifications.

Question 81:

Please refer to Structural Arch Plans, Drawing Sheet Nos. 258 & 259, concerning the depth of excavation below the inverts of the existing pipelines.

- A) What is(are) the distance(s) from the bottom of excavation for the 12" Coarse Aggregate for Foundation Stabilization and the inverts of the existing pipelines?
- B) No item for Sheet piling and Shoring is indicated for this structure as there is for other structures on this project; is Sheet piling and Shoring required, and if so, how will it be paid?

I-95 & US 202 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- C) If Sheet piling and Shoring is not required, what (if any) shoulder height of soil (measured from the bottom of each pipeline) must be maintained along the edges of each pipeline to keep the pipelines from buckling and safe?

Response to Question 81:

- A) The locations of the pipes were determined graphically from archive plans. The distance between the bottom of the coarse aggregate and the bottom of the pipes is approximately 2 feet.
B) See Note 5 on Sheet 259.
C) See the Typical Section on Sheet 258 and Notes 4 & 5 on Sheet 259.

Question 80:

Basis of payment for 614861, Structural Plate Arch (Steel), says that payment includes "temporary support systems for maintaining shape during grouting..." I can not find anywhere that grouting required; is grouting required?

Response to Question 80:

No, grouting is not required. This item can be used for lining deteriorated arches, a process that involves grouting. This is not the case here, so grouting is not required.

Question 79:

Is there any chance this bid date of August 11th can again be extended in order to allow more time for additional competitive responses?

Response to Question 79:

The Department has no cause to extend the Bid Date at this time.

Question 78:

Can you provide details for bid item No. 1480. 720529 P.C.C. Safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face ?

Response to Question 78:

See Standard Construction Details for 42" high barrier

Question 77:

Dwg. 12, 16, 42, 43, & 45, I-95sb (west side); other areas where work is of similar nature (no earthwork required past edge of pvt.) with trees within the loc.

- (A) is tree clearing required from the edge of pavement to the loc from approx. Sta. 250+00 (503+68 nb) to sta.259+50 required ?
(B) if clearing is required, does the tree area need to be stumped & the root mat removed ?

Response to Question 77:

Response to both questions is Yes.

Question 76:

We request a 2 week bid date extension due the fact that we have been unable to verify the earthwork, since cross-sections have not been made available to date.

Response to Question 76:

The Department has no cause to extend the Bid Date at this time.

Question 75:

When will a revised disk of the plan sheets be mailed to plan holders who received a defective disk with plan sheet files unable to be printed/viewed as stated in revised adden. No. 1 dated July 20, 2011?

Response to Question 75:

This was mailed out on August 2, 2011.

Question 74:

Ref earthwork summary on plan sheet 6 under excavation available for embankment indicates all excavation from project to be spoils. Will none of this excavated material meet the f borrow you are showing as all import (59407 cy)?

Response to Question 74:

Because of phasing, available stockpiling locations, and questionable quality of the existing material it is assumed that no excavated material will be available for reuse as F Borrow.

Question 73:

Bid Quantity for Item 712005 R-4 Rip-Rap is 945 SY. Based on Plan Sheets 42 thru 71 the quantity shown is 217 SY. Where is the balance of this item found?

Response to Question 73:

217 SY is the correct quantity for 712005 and will be changed via addendum.

Question 72:

The scale on Plan Sheet 163 as stated a 1" = 20' is not correct.

Response to Question 72:

The comment is correct and also applies to sheet 164. The 1" = 20' is applicable only to half size plans. Also, the scale bar is incorrect. However, the dimensions shown on the plans are correct and sufficient to construct the culverts.

Question 71:

There is no Bid Item for Elastomeric Bearing Pads at S-2 or S-3 (Bridge Nos. 1-762 & 1-763) as there is for S1 (Br. NO. 1-570); see Bid Item 605581 Elastomeric Bearing Pads on Drawing S1-3 (Sheet No. 231). Under what item are the bearings for these bridge to be paid?

Response to Question 71:

As per Note #3 on Sheet S2-11 and Note #3 on Sheet S3-11, the bearing pads for these structures are incidental to the steel structures bid price.

Question 70:

Will the field office be installed as one complex? Will this complex require 12,000 sf of parking? Is the furniture listed on page 305 for each field office or for the complex?

Response to Question 70:

All furnishing are described for the complex as a whole, not for each individual unit

I-95 & US 202 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 69:

Does deldot have property available to set up the field office at no charge to the contractor?

Response to Question 69:

No

Question 68:

What is the depth of the pipe anchor shown on plan sheet 162?

Response to Question 68:

4'

Question 67:

Are settlement plates not required on this project?

Response to Question 67:

The contract documents only specify settlement monuments.

Question 66:

Sheet 244 indicates a jacking detail at pier 2 w/ studs atop a single diaphragm at that location. Where is the Detail showing the concrete outline at the pier 2 Diaphragm?

Response to Question 66:

Sheet 244 clearly shows one acceptable jacking plan. As outlined in the Special Provision for Jacking, the contractor is free to develop his/her own jacking plan using these plans, archive plans, and field conditions.

Question 65:

Structure 1-570 - fascia beam elevation on sheet 241 of Plans does not indicate top flange tension limits. Should we assume balance of beams in span 2 & 3 would Follow suit?

Response to Question 65:

Sheet 241 will be revised as part of Addendum 2 to show the limits of the top flange in tension. This area is the 42 feet between the splices.

Question 64:

Please refer to Project Note 7 on Plan N1 of 3 (Sheet No. 4) and advise as to where (under which bid item) the cost of removing such items as Bollards, Catch Basins, End Walls, Masonry Walls, Items Specified in Bridge Notes for Each Bridge and Other Miscellaneous Items, which are identified as being "In addition to the breakout sheet, items to be removed under Item 211000 - Removal of Structures and Obstructions shall include, but not be limited to the following", since there is no line on the Breakout Sheet for these items.

Response to Question 64:

Please refer to response to Q13.

Question 63:

Please refer to Construction Phasing MOT Drawing MOT 15 of 139 (Sheet No. 280) where Sequence of Construction Notes 28 and 29 appear to have the Structure Nos. 763 and 764 reversed. Note 28 describes Structure No. 763 as Ramp 5 Over I-95, but Ramp 5 Over I-95 is Structure No. 764. Note 29 is similarly reversed; please verify.

Response to Question 63:

It is correct that 763 refers to the ramp 5 bridge over new ramp 7 and 764 refers to the ramp 5 bridge over I-95. The references on MOT Sheet 280 are incorrect. Refer to response to Q23.

Question 62:

Please clarify the method of measurement as it pertains to spread footings for payment under Item 619511 Exploratory Drilling. The Special Provisions describes this work as "to characterize the approximate rock mass quality of the bedrock to a point 10 feet below" and Construction Methods says to "Advance the hole through the overburden..."

- 1) Is measurement for the Exploratory Drilling at spread footing areas to begin from original ground, bottom of footing or some other elevation?
- 2) Also, please verify that Exploratory Drilling is not required at Bridge No. 762 (S2) Ramp 5 over US 202.

Response to Question 62:

- 1) Pre-drilling will be measured from where the pre-drilling actually begins, which will be at the bottom of the MSE Wall.
- 2) This is correct.

Question 61:

Bridge Drawing S1-5 (Sheet No. 233) shows construction of the median during Stage 4 (in Phase 3) being performed within and protected by concrete Construction Barrier while maintaining 2 traffic lanes each direction and Note 1 under Sequence of Rehabilitation Work, Stage 4, says to set up maintenance of traffic pattern for Stage 4 construction in accordance with Traffic Control Plan.

Construction Phasing MOT Drawing MOT 134 of 139 (Sheet No. 399) says to construct the median from Sta. 1005+80 to 1022+07 during off-peak or night work hours by closing the lane adjacent to the permanent median work area on both directions of US 202; the bridge median is within the limits of the aforementioned stations.

Construction Phasing MOT Drawings MOT 135, 136 & 137 of 139 (Sheet Nos. 400, 401 & 402) show barrels closing 1 northbound thru traffic lane and 1 southbound left turn lane while maintaining 1 northbound thru lane and 2 southbound thru lanes during off-peak hours. Please clarify which of the two different traffic patterns the Contractor is to utilize for construction of the bridge median.

Response to Question 61:

The intent is to use the MOT plans to construct the proposed median in this area. The concrete Construction Barrier shown on Sheet 233 is not needed, unless directed by the Engineer.

Question 60:

Sheet 15 of 139, item #29, note #2 states that the contractor is to "utilize the option 1 detour or option 2 detour as described in the MOT general notes....". I could not locate the option 2 detour in the plans. Please advise as to the sheet where Option 2 Detour is located.

Response to Question 60:

The Option 2 detour is "Detour Plan – Ramp #6172". This is defined on the MOT General Notes Sheet (Sheet 268, MOT Sheet 3 of 139), under Work Hour Restrictions, Note #8. This detour is only to be used during the hours noted.

Question 59:

Ref bid item 705519, patterned pcc concrete sidewalk on page 12 of the proposal is shown as 6". On detail sheet 155 it shows item 501526 patterned pcc concrete pavement, item 501526. There is no bid item in the proposal indicating item 501526. Please clarify.

Response to Question 59:

Use Item 501526. This change will be included in an addendum.

Question 58:

Note #9 on sheet 405 of 482 states that "Type III Barricades will be paid for under item 743524". That bid item does not exist. The Type III Barricades for this project are currently located in bid item 743507.

Please clarify on which bid item number is correct for the Type III Barricades.

Response to Question 58:

You are correct. Type III Barricades will be paid under item 743507.

Question 57:

Plan sheet #195 (S4-9 of 23) & 212 (S3-3 of 19), note #1 states that "Pipes for separating the piles from the MSE wall backfill shall be installed at locations of piles prior to constructing MSE wall. Piles shall be installed after quarantine period at the center of the pipes."

What is the length of the quarantine period? When does the quarantine period begin?

Response to Question 57:

The quarantine period is 30 days and begins when the MSE Walls have reached their proposed grade. As part of Addendum 2, a note will be added to clarify this.

Question 56:

Where is the asphalt binder for item 401577 shown on the plans? The spec section on page 65 indicates that it could be pg 64-22 pg 70-22, or pg 76-22 as indicated on the plans.

Response to Question 56:

Use PG 76-22

Question 55:

Where are underdrain outlets 73 and 76 located on plan sheet 57?

Response to Question 55:

Underdrain Outlets 73 and 76 are correctly shown on plan sheet 53 and in the schedule box on plan sheet 54. The schedule box on plan sheet 57 is not valid on that sheet.

Question 54:

Specs for 6" underdrain on page 207 of the specs implies the del #8 stone is required around the underdrain pipe. Deldot std spec d-8 shows del #57 stone. Which is correct?

Response to Question 54:

Use DE 57 Stone as specified in the Supplemental Specification to the Delaware Standard Specifications.

Question 53:

Where does the contractor determine the invert and rim elevation of mh-40 shown on plan sheet 59?

Response to Question 53:

The approximate depth of MH-R40 is 6.6'. As-built elevations were used to establish the invert elevation of the existing inlet at the location of MH-R40 which is approximately 185.7. The proposed TG elevation pending the placement of the final pavement course is 192.30.

Question 52:

Where is pipe run p12 that is shown in drainage schedule (plan sheet 70) found on construction plan sheet 69?

Response to Question 52:

Please see response to Q20.

Question 51:

Drawings indicate poles and luminaires to be removed by contractor but there is no pay item. How will the contract be paid for removing the poles & luminaries?

Response to Question 51:

Existing poles and luminaries will be removed under item 211000 - Removal of Structures and Obstructions

Question 50:

After review of drawings and specifications we were unable to determine the intent for running conduits up poles or structures. What is the intent? We will need this to determine the conduit fittings and supports.

Response to Question 50:

Plans show an ITMS conduit run onto BR 1-570 for the RSWMIS Passive Pavement Sensors (SSC Sheet 6A). Also, conduit will be run up some of the temporary poles being installed for temporary lighting.

Question 49:

Sheet 280, note #5-11.G states that an impact attenuator is to be installed on Ramp 5 Station 51+16, but the MOT Drawings (Sheet 33 of 139) does not show an impact attenuator at that location. Can you verify that an impact attenuator is required?

Response to Question 49:

An impact attenuator is not needed at this location. This will be corrected by addendum.

Question 48:

The Junction Wells on the Signal plan say refer to the Signing and Conduit drawings but do not show any details for a type of junction well. How do we price these Junction wells specify?

Response to Question 48:

Junction Well types are called out in the circle identifiers (e.g. JW/4 is Junction Well Type 4). Junction Well details are found in the DeIDOT Standard Details.

Question 47:

The lighting drawings show 3" GRC on the Signing & Conduit drawings do not specify a type of conduit. Which conduit type will be shall be installed?

Response to Question 47:

All conduits are galvanized except 4" conduit (bore and trench) for ITMS and 3" Schedule 40 PVC conduit which is for use on temporary wood poles (which are placed for temporary lighting).

Question 46:

It appears that the quantity for bid items 612025 and 612026 are incorrect on the pricing proposal.

Response to Question 46:

Please see response to Q8.

Question 45:

With the issuance of add #1 you included page 236 and says that is to replace the same page in the proposal. This page must be incorrectly numbered as page 236 in original proposal is for itm 744505 adjust or repair existing conduit junction well. Please clarify

Response to Question 45:

Page 236 was not addressed in Addendum 1. Page 236 is correct as is.

Question 44:

On plan sheet 135 the standard detail shows 24" rep cl iii and section a-a shows 24" rep cl iv. Which is correct?

Response to Question 44:

The correct designation is Class IV.

Question 43:

On profile sheet 94 you show a di e55. Where is the information on this inlet found on the drainage inlet schedule on the construction plans?

Response to Question 43:

The correct designation is P/R55 as shown on Plan Sheet 49.

Question 42:

The quantity for bid items 708051 and 708052 do not appear to be correct.

Response to Question 42:

Please see response to Q25.

Question 41:

There are two each item 708505 junction boxes, special shown on the pricing proposal. Jb 14 on plan sheet 43 and 44 is one. Where is the other junction box shown on the plans?

Response to Question 41:

Please see response to Q29.

Question 40:

Is the depth of mh 124 correct at 0.85 vertical feet w/18" rcp in and out? (see plan sheet 47 and 48)

Response to Question 40:

Please see response to Q24.

August 8, 2011

Question 39:

Please refer to Plan Sheet No. 187A (S4-1A) regarding the 4" Underdrain Detail which shows using DE #57 Stone backfill. Standard Specification Section 715 requires the use of DE #8 Stone Backfill. 4" Underdrain is also required as shown on Plan Sheet No. 172 (S2-4) but there is no detail as there is for Bridge S4, so DE #8 Stone Backfill would be required in accordance with Standard Specification Section 715.

A) Please verify that #57 Stone Backfill is to be used at Bridge S4 and #8 Stone Backfill is to be used at Bridge S2.

Response to Question 39:

As part of Addendum 2, a detail will be added to sheet 169 to clarify the underdrain installation. This detail matches the detail shown for Bridge 1-764 and in the Standard Construction Details. It should be noted that the Standard Specifications for Section 715 were updated via a Supplemental Specification (3/18/2004) to require #57 stone instead of the previously required #8 stone.

Question 38:

Please refer to Plan Sheet No. 216 (S3-7) regarding a 1'0" layer of Coarse Aggregate for Foundation Stabilization shown underneath the MSE Abutment footing (pile cap). There is no mention of this material in Item Nos. 602553, 602557 or 602670 for Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls in the Special Provisions and it is not listed in the Quantities appearing on Plan Sheet No. 210 (S3-1).

- A) Is this material to be paid for under Bid Item 608000, another item or incidental to MSE walls?
- B) Is geotextile fabric required around the Coarse Aggregate, and if so, under which Bid Item will it be paid?
- C) No such material is shown beneath the MSE Abutment footing at S-4; please verify that it is not required.

Response to Question 38:

A) As part of Addendum 2, notes have been added to clarify the coarse aggregate. It is required under the stub abutments and will be paid for under item 608000. The quantity for item

I-95 & US 202 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

608000 will be updated on the bid proposal form and on the bridge quantities listed in the plans.

- B) No. Geotextile is not required.
- C) See the response to your question A above.

Question 37:

Please refer to Plan Sheet Nos. 193, 213 & 214 (S4-7, S3-4 & S3-5 respectively) regarding #57 DE (Crushed) Stone shown as backfill along the inside faces of MSE Abutment and Wingwalls. There is no mention of this material in Item Nos. 602553, 602557 or 602670 for Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls in the Special Provisions and it is not listed in the Quantities appearing on Plan Sheet Nos. 187A or 210 (S4-1A or S3-1 respectively).

- A) Is this material to be paid for under Bid Item 302012, another item or incidental to MSE walls?
- B) Is geotextile fabric required around the #57 stone, and if so, under which Bid Item will it be paid?

Response to Question 37:

- A) As part of Addendum 2, notes will be added to the plans to clarify this. The #57 stone behind the MSE Wall panels will be included in the bid price for the applicable MSE Wall.
- B) No. The joints between MSE Wall panels are required to have fabric as shown in the MSE Wall Special Provision, but Geotextile is not required around the #57 stone.

Question 36:

Note 1 on Plan Sheet Nos. 195 and 211 (S4-9 & S3-3 respectively) says that piles shall be installed after quarantine period. Project Note 16 on Plan Sheet No. 5 says that an estimated 30 day quarantine period is expected for the locations mentioned in Note 16.

- A) Is the quarantine period for driving the piles the same as Project Note 16? If not, what is the quarantine period?
- B) Portions of the stub abutment footings fall outside of the locations mentioned by Project Note 16. For example, the limits of the footing (pile cap) at S4, Abutment B are from Ramp 5 Sta. 48+88.83 to 49+12.77 and the nearest location mentioned by Note 16 is Ramp 5 Sta. 49+05 to 52+41. Should the locations in Note 16 be extended to include the entire footing of Abutment B at S4 and both Abutment A and B footings at S-3?

Response to Question 36:

- A) As part of Addendum 2, notes will be added to the plans to clarify this. The piles will be installed after the quarantine period of 30 days.
- B) As part of Addendum 2, notes will be added to the plans to clarify this. The piles will be installed after the quarantine period of 30 days. Abutment B for Bridge 1-764 and Abutments A & B for Bridge 1-763 should be included in this quarantine period.

Question 35:

The following Item Numbers on the bridge plans do not match Item Numbers on the Bid Proposal Forms: 302500 Delaware No. 3 Stone, 602648 Precast Capstone and 715000 Perforated Pipe Underdrains, 4" (also what size, 4" or 6"); please clarify.

Response to Question 35:

As part of Addendum 2, item 302500 will be changed to 302011 on the plans, item 602650 will be changed to item 602648 in the bid proposal, and item 715000 will be added to the bid proposal with a quantity of 565 LF.

Question 34:

Notes for Item 619511, Exploratory Drilling, on bridge drawings S4-1 (Sheet 187) and S3-1 (Sheet 210) indicate air track drilling on a 10-foot grid within the limits of the abutment or the footing area in the area indicated on the plans. Please provide a sketch to clarify which area on the plans (stub abutment, MSE footing, both?).

Response to Question 34:

Notes will be added to Sheets 187 and 210 as part of Addendum 2 to better clarify the layout of the exploratory drilling. The drilling is needed under the stub abutments to identify the depth of the rock for pile driving purposes.

Question 33:

According to the Special Provisions and the Bid Proposal Forms, Item 619511 Exploratory Drilling is to be measured and paid for at the Contract unit price per linear foot, however, quantities on the bridge plans indicate the payment unit as Each; please clarify.

Response to Question 33:

The unit of measurement should be per linear foot. The plans and quantities will be corrected as part of Addendum 2.

Question 32:

Please clarify the method of measurement as it pertains to stub abutments at MSE walls, for payment under Item 619512 Pre-Drilling for End Bearing Piles, which says "Measurement shall be from the bottom of the footing excavation to the end of the pre-drilled hole." Is measurement to begin from original ground, bottom of footing or some other elevation?

Response to Question 32:

Pre-drilling will be measured from where the pre-drilling actually begins, which will be at the bottom of the MSE Wall.

Question 31:

Please clarify from what elevation the measurement for payment will begin for Item 619511, Exploratory Drilling (original ground, bottom of footing excavation or some other)?

Response to Question 31:

Exploratory drilling will be performed from original ground and will be paid as such.

Question 30:

Please provide minimum and plan haunch depths for all beams at all bridges on this project.

Response to Question 30:

Minimum haunch depths will be added to the plans as part of Addendum 2.

Question 29:

The Drainage schedule shows only 1 EA Junction Box, but the bid form has 2 EA. Please clarify.

Response to Question 29:

The 3 drainage structures found in the schedules on Sheet 44 are correct. The correct quantities and item numbers will be changed via an addendum.

Question 28:

ITMS conduit run schedule show ITMS cables and sensor cables. Is this work to be done by others?

Response to Question 28:

Yes, work is to be done by others.

Question 27:

Drawing 444 indicates work to be done that includes relocating CCTV poles, RSWMIS poles, subsurface sensors, & pavement sensors. Currently there is no pay items for this work. Will this work be done by others?

Response to Question 27:

Yes, work is to be done by others.

Question 26:

Pages 479-482 indicates traffic signal work to be performed. How will the contractor be paid for this work?

Response to Question 26:

Contractor will be paid under the appropriate bid items.

Question 25:

Per your structure schedule (Inlets and Manholes on pages 42 - 71 of 482) the total number of structures in the schedule match up to the total number of structures on the bid form, but two of the bid items have more quantity and two of the bid items have less quantity than specified in the bid form.

Bid Item & Description

Bid item per schedule

Bid item per bid form

708051	- 34" x 24" Drainage Inlet 23 EA 24 EA
708052	- 48" x 30" Drainage Inlet 31 EA 32 EA
708056	- 66" x 66" Drainage Inlet 9 EA 8 EA
708057	- 72" x 24" Drainage Inlet 5 EA 4 EA

Please verify and/or correct the bid form and structure schedules.

Response to Question 25:

The schedules found in the plans are correct. The bid forms will be adjusted via addendum.

Question 24:

Please check the Manhole schedule on sheet 48 of 482. MH 124 T.G elevation 133.26 with an invert elevation of 132.41. This manhole is too shallow, please verify / correct the elevations.

Response to Question 24:

The invert elevation is correct; however the T.G. elevation is incorrect and should be 135.52.

Question 23:

On the MOT / E & S drawings for Phase 1, Stage 2, (sheet 280) reference is made to bridges 763 & 764. Number 763 is described as the ramp 5 bridge over I-95 and number 764 is described as the ramp 5 bridge over new ramp 7. However on the bridge drawings the numbers are reversed (763 refers to the ramp 5 bridge over new ramp 7 and 764 refers to the ramp 5 bridge over I-95). Please reconcile this discrepancy.

Response to Question 23:

It is correct that 763 refers to the ramp 5 bridge over new ramp 7 and 764 refers to the ramp 5 bridge over I-95. The references on MOT Sheet 280 are incorrect.

Question 22:

Please specify which top units correspond to each inlet. The Drainage inlet charts only specify the grate type.

Response to Question 22:

Please refer to D-5 of the DelDOT Standard Construction Details.

Question 21:

Please give the location of the 20 LF of Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe, Type S, 18" (612523).

Response to Question 21:

A location is not specified. The pipe could be used for construction activities as needed and as directed by the Engineer.

Question 20:

Please give the location of pipe run P-I2. It is a 24" Pipe run that is on sheet 70 of 482.

Response to Question 20:

24" RCP P-12 is not needed. The total quantity of Item 612023 24" RCP found in the Bid Proposal Forms is correct and does not include P-12 (71').

Question 19:

Please provide the boring logs for all borings shown on the bridge plans and the construction plans.

Response to Question 19:

Boring information has been added to the website.

Question 18:

Please provide drawings of the existing bridges

Response to Question 18:

Drawings of the existing bridges have been added to the website.

Question 17:

The stratum information that is shown on profile sheets appears to be shown in reference to the proposed grade rather than the existing grade. Is that correct?

Response to Question 17:

The boring logs reference to proposed baselines for location. The references shown on the boring logs give the boring number, BL STA, offset from BL STA and elevation of boring. The borings are not all plotted at the referenced elevations for clarity (overlap).

Question 16:

Will the state be supplying a geotechnical report?

Response to Question 16:

Boring logs and Plans for the existing bridges have been added to the website.

Question 15: cancelled

Question 14:

With the considerable Structure Demolition involved with this Contract, we need the Plans from the previous two Projects for this Interchange:

- 1) Contract No's. 64-04-021, 64-01-054, 64-01-055 (One Project) let 5/18/1965. This Contract contained all of the Ramp F Bridges that are to be demolished.
- 2) Contract Nos. 65-06-001 & 65-08-005 (One Project) let 7/12/1966. This Contract contained the U.S. 202 Bridge over I-95 that is to be modified.

Response to Question 14:

Plans for the existing bridges and all the structural borings for the bridges and sign structures have been added to the website.

Question 13:

Item 211000 has a breakout sheet which lists structures that contain removal. Removal of Structures and Obstructions also exists within the roadway but a line item is not provided for this on the breakout sheet. Can a line item for roadway structures & obstruction removal be added? Otherwise, we will need to know where to put the cost for this work.

Response to Question 13:

This will be addressed in Addendum 2.

Question 12:

On bridge 1-763 sheet 10 under steel notes you indicate all bolts to be 7/8" A325 type 1 but on sheet 11 note 2 under general notes you want bolts to be hot dipped galvanized 1" diam. Which one do you want?

Response to Question 12:

Please see the response to Question 10.

Question 11:

Bridge S-4 general note 7 under structural steel you indicate shop assemble of entire superstructure do we still have to setup if we use CNC full size holes?

Response to Question 11:

Yes. Our intention for such a complex structure is to have the superstructure shop assembled.

Question 10:

On bridge S-2(I-95 ramp 5 over US202)

Sheet 11 note 5 under steel notes you indicate all bolts to be 7/8" A325 type 1 & on end diaphragms but on same page note 2 under general notes you want bolts to be hot dipped galvanized 1" diam. Which one do you want?

Response to Question 10:

Our intention is to use ASTM A325 Type 1 High Strength Bolts for the structural steel connections. The note regarding the 1" diameter hot dipped galvanized bolts was incorrectly referenced into the bridge sheets. The specific sheets this covers are S2-11, S3-10, and S3-11.

Question 9:

Page 5 of the specifications requires completion of sworn statement, attesting to Non-Collusion. It goes on to indicate that the form of this sworn statement is included in the proposal. We cannot find the Non-Collusion Certification form in the proposal. Please advise where we can find it.

Response to Question 9:

The Non-Collusion statement is included on the second page of the Certification page.

Question 8:

On sheets 44, 46 & 54 of 482, the 30" RCP Class IV & V are shown on the Drainage pipe schedule. The 30" RCP CL-IV has an overrun of 111' and the 30" RCP CL-V is underrun by 111' compared to the project totals. Pipe run P-139 is a 30" Class - IV run of 111'. Should this pipe run P -139 be 30" Class - V?

Response to Question 8:

P-139 should be Class V. The total quantity of Class IV and Class V as shown in the Bid Proposal Forms is correct.

Question 7:

Please advise as to the location of the coping detail with necessary steel reinforcement that will be installed on top of the three (3) MSE walls.

Response to Question 7:

Details of the coping are to be submitted by the MSE Wall manufacturer as part of the MSE Wall design and working drawings. The coping is included in the payment for the MSE Wall as shown in the Special Provision for Item 602553.

Question 6:

Can the state provide us with the existing elevations for the MSE walls at the bridge structures on the following sheets: 193, 213, 214?

Response to Question 6:

There are no existing MSE Walls. The proposed MSE Wall elevations are outlined quite clearly. The elevations for the proposed steps up the slopes for the leveling pad are to be determined by the MSE Wall manufacturer. The minimum depth to the top of the leveling pad is 2' as shown on Sheet 193. Minimum elevations have been included on the sheets. Cross sections have been made available which may also assist in answering your question.

Question 5:

When is the deadline to ask questions? I was unable to find anything in the proposal manual.

Response to Question 5:

The Standard Specifications (referenced on page 4 of the proposal) require questions be submitted no later than six business days prior to the bid opening.

Question 4:

Every other plan sheet from 43 to 69 is blank. Can these be reissued?
Can an excel spreadsheet be made available for the breakout sheets?

Response to Question 4:

The plan sheet problem has been corrected by reposting same to the Website and providing planholders with a disk containing all plan sheets. The Department will consider making breakout sheets available in spreadsheet format, and will post them on the web if so decided.

Question 3:

We see the above project was advertised on 7/4. The bid date is set for 7/26. This is a substantial project with a short turnaround time to bid. Will the bid date be extended?

Response to Question 3:

On July 20, the bid date was extended to August 11, 2011.

Question 2:

We are having problems printing all the website plans for the above referenced project. Starting on page 43 through 69 every other page is blank (on the screen) and when you print those blank pages it just says "unofficial website copy" but no drawing. Please advise

Response to Question 2:

The plan sheet problem has been corrected by reposting same to the Website and providing planholders with a disk containing all plan sheets.

I-95 & US 202 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1:

The plans and specifications for subcontract bidders will they be available at Delaware Contractors Association or the Bear-Canal District DELDOT Route 7 Office Building. The announcement said they are available in the Dover Plans Room. I think it would be a good idea since it is a New Castle County Job to have them here also for review.

Response to Question 1:

The plans and specifications are available for review on the Web at <http://bids.delaware.gov/>, and in the DelDOT Administration Building in Dover.