



CONTRACT NO. T200809003.01

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**** FINAL POSTED DATE ****

May 24, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following new questions and responses through May 20, 2011 (last day for questions)
A4Q14 – A4Q16 – A4Q18
Questions A4Q40 through A4Q49
All other questions have been answered previously

Question A4Q49:

How is the contractor to be paid for removing overhead and cantilever sign structures?

Please explain Note 4 in the signing legend on sheet 711A, “Renew existing sign”. What is the extent of this item and how is it paid?

Response to Question A4Q49:

Please refer to note 4 on sheet 4, the Project Note indicates item 211000, Removal of Structures and Obstructions shall include the removal of overhead and cantilever sign structures.

Renew existing sign is the replacement of a damaged or worn sign or post in kind:

The extent of the work is the removal of an existing sign and post and installation of a new sign and post in the same location with the sign face reflecting the same message. This is paid for as a removal and install under item number 749687 - Installation or Removal of Traffic Sign on Post.

Question A4Q48:

Does DelDOT anticipate a 5th Addendum? Will DelDOT Consider extending the bid date by 1 to 2 weeks in order for contractors to adequately prepare our bids?

Response to Question A4Q48:

The Department does not anticipate a 5th Addendum. The bid date is not extended.

Question A4Q47:

Ref the underdrain system shown on barrier detail plan sheets 182 to 185, will deldot permit the use of a prefabricated longitudinal edge drain as an alternate drainage system. I understand that this has been allowed on previous deldot projects.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A4Q47:

The contractor needs to provide a product that meets the appropriate specification.

Question A4Q46:

With the issuance of add #4 (earthwork summary on plan sheet 5) it appears that deldot has a large bust in bid quantity for the quantity of topsoil that this project is short. Your bid item 733002 topsoiling is 10900 SY and at 6' depth will require 1817 CY of topsoil which is what you basically show is available on site (140 CY + 1821 CY = 1961 CY). Your bid quantity for item 732002, topsoil at 6" depth, is 135908 SY which will require 22652 CY of topsoil. Deldot lists the shortage of topsoil at 14351 CY

Response to Question A4Q46:

The bid quantity is correct, the Earthwork Summary on plan sheet 5 is provided for information only and the final earthwork summary will be coordinated with the successful bidder.

Question A4Q45b:

Is 4" underdrain required behind the legend "T" barrier as shown on dwg. 19 ? ("T" barrier is Item 720529, which on dwg. 182 detail does not indicate any underdrain)

Response to Question A4Q45b:

The underdrain shown in front of the "T" barrier on sheet 19 is to drain the sub-grade of the roadway and is a 6" underdrain and it is required as per the plan.

Question A4Q45a:

If 14in. Thick, what type of fill is required from top of footing to bottom of rip-rap ?

Response to Question A4Q45a:

The fill material below the rip rap shall meet the requirements of Borrow Type F unless otherwise noted.

Question A4Q45:

Re. Item 712005 – RipRap, R-4Dwg. 19, 23 - 26, & 30. Does the rip-rap extend from the top of the footing to the top of the barrier or is the rip-Rap thickness 14in. As shown on standard construction detail E-10 and underlain with Geotextile?

Response to Question A4Q45:

The Rip-Rap R-4 shall be 14" as shown on the standard detail. Geotextile is not required in this location.

Question A4Q44:

Line Item 325, Stormwater Management Pond, 750 CY was added by Addendum No. 4. It appears that the Ponds #533 and #534 will be built by others prior to this contract. Is the item and quantity intended to cover the cleanout of sediment and the conversion from a Sediment Basin to A SWM Pond. What is to be included in this item??? Is seeding to be included or is the paid separately? How is dewatering of these ponds going to be paid for. Please clarify/advise. Information is in the Spec and on the plans.

Response to Question A4Q44:

Information is in the Spec and on the plans.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A4Q43:

It is our understanding that the breakout sheets will be used if the Department deletes a breakout item or the Department adds or deletes quantity to a breakout item to adjust the Lump Sum Bid Item price accordingly. Otherwise; regardless if the quantity on the breakout sheet is correct or not and the Department makes no changes; the Contractor will be paid the Lump Sum Bid Item price. Please confirm/clarify. The response to question 214 seems to validate the above assumption and the response to question 87 seems to call into question the above conclusion. Please advise.

Response to Question A4Q43:

Please refer to the response to question 214. Question 214 was a confirmation request from Question 87. The answer to 214 is the result of that request and holds true for question A4Q43.

Question A4Q42:

Addendum 4, Section 602772 under Architectural Treatment requires the panel size and shape to be 5' x 5' and cruciform in shape. A wall company claims a trademark on this shape in their literature (see attached third page "Page 1" highlighted in yellow). This limits this bid item to a single source. Is that what you intended?

Response to Question A4Q42:

Please refer to the response to question A424.

Question A4Q41:

Notes were added to all the post tensioned caps requiring Mass Concrete Procedures. Plans for Bridge S6 refers to special provision 602785 which is not included in addendum No.4 or any other contract documents. What are the parameters, required equipment, limitations and reporting required for the mass concrete placement(s)?

Response to Question A4Q41:

Special Provisions 602785 & 602786 were included in Addendum 3 and address this issue.

Question A4Q40:

With the issuance of add #4 the utility statement was changed. We have a bid item 614605 12" steel casing pipe. This item does not appear in the utility statement so where is it used on this project?

Response to Question A4Q40:

Please bid the quantity of 12" steel casing pipe as listed.

Question A4Q39:

Addendum #4 provided revised Delaware State wage rates, labeled "Effective March 15, 2011", some of which were decreased from the previously provided Delaware State wage rates labeled "Effective March 15, 2010". Prior to Addendum #4, the Federal wage rate General Decision #DE100013 dated 05/21/2010 originally provided in the contract proposal, matched the Delaware State wage rates effective March 15, 2010. We are required by law to pay the higher of the two rates however the Federal General Decision #DE100013 may be outdated prior to the award of the project.

Please confirm that the Delaware State wage rates "Effective March 15, 2011" and the "Federal General Decision #DE100013" are the only two (2) sets of wage rates that we will be obligated to pay.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A4Q39:

The state wage rates labeled “Effective March 15, 2011” and the federal wage rate General Decision #DE100013 dated 05/21/2010 are the only wage rates that apply to this contract. The only exception would be if the federal General Decision wage rates are revised 10 days or more from the bid date. This action is not expected, if it does occur, all bidders will be notified prior to the bid date.

Question A4Q38:

Please explain what pay items besides loop detectors that are associated with the Signal Plan drawings on sheets 742 & 743. These drawings show proposed signals, however there are no bid items for signals.

Response to Question A4Q38:

The contractor is only responsible for the construction of the underground facilities and loop installation for the two signals. DelDOT Traffic forces furnish and install all other required equipment and material.

Question A4Q37:

In Addendum 4 - Joint Venture ONLY it states there are 4 pages. The 4th page is blank is that correct?

Response to Question A4Q37:

The Joint Venture forms consist of two pages for the Certification, and one page for the bid bond.

Question A4Q36:

Specification section 763626 notes that “The posted index price will be the monthly price most recent data published by the US Department of, US Energy Information Administration”. It goes on to note “Price Index (FB) for Diesel Fuel Per Gallon (Per Liter) = \$2.256. The current posted price online (updated May 2, 2011 for Feb 2011) is \$3.043. Will the base price for the project be updated prior to the bid date?

Response to Question A4Q36:

No, the base price will not be updated.

Question A4Q35:

As far as i can tell the answer to question number 390 has not been included in the addendum. If it has can you tell me where that detail is found.

Response to Question A4Q35:

Question 390 was answered, there is no detail provided on the plans or specifications. The Department expects visual observation to be sufficient to enable bidding this item.

Question A4Q34:

Specification section 401502 notes that “The Project Asphalt Cement Price will be anticipated Delaware Posted Asphalt Cement Price expected to be in receipt at the time of receipt of bids”. It goes on to note that “The Project Asphalt Cement Base Price for the project will be \$470.00 per ton”. This price has been revised since the project was first advertised some time ago. The current posted price online is \$636.67. Will the base price for the project be updated prior to the bid date?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A4Q34:

No, the base price will not be updated.

Question A4Q33:

The \$500.00 or \$1,000.00 per day payment, as outlined by 619501 and 619502 of the SP, seems inadequate when compared to an estimated actual cost of \$10,000.00 per day for a piling crew. Is the Contractor to recoup the difference between these costs by somehow building it into the bid? If the successful bidder has built such a cost into the bid and it does not get used, the Department will have paid for something it did not need to pay for. Instead, would the Department be willing to remove the risk from the Contractor by providing a pre-determined amount in the bid to be used to pay for only the actual cost of such occurrences?

Response to Question A4Q33:

No, please bid the project as presented.

Question A4Q32:

The SP and notes on the Bridge Drawings indicate that the Contractor will restrike all test piles, and any production piles that may be designated, within a period of two (2) to five (5) days from initial driving. The SP also indicate that payment for restrikes of test piles and production piles with requested wait time exceeding five (5) working days will be paid per each day as set forth in the SP and that any idle equipment, idle labor, mobilization costs, set-up costs, delay costs, etc. shall be incidental to the price for these items and that such payment shall constitute full compensation for performing the restrikes. Assuming that any or all of the piling work is on the critical path of the schedule, and because this is an A + B job where the affect of each additional day on the schedule has a consequence of \$35,000.00, will the Contractor be entitled to a time extension?

Response to Question A4Q32:

No, the contractor would not be entitled to a time extension.

Question A4Q31:

Addendum #4 changed the Special Provisions (SP) and Notes on the Bridge Drawings concerning requirements for Test Pile and Production Pile Restrikes. Although the SP are clear that all test piles are to be restriked and dynamically tested, it is not clear if dynamic testing is required for every production pile restrike; please clarify.

Response to Question A4Q31:

Dynamic testing for production pile restrike will be at the request of the Engineer.

Question A4Q30:

The table that is provided for the Low Level Lighting Foundation (in response to Question 364) states which foundation corresponds to each light, but Details (A, B, C, & D) for the Low Level Light Pole Foundations shown on sheet 703 of 803 shows a minimum depth below grade that the foundation should be installed. The detail and the specs do not mention the determining factor on how deep the foundations will actually need to be. Can the department provide actual depths below grade for each Low Level Light Foundation?

Response to Question A4Q30:

The 10'-0" dimension is the required depth for each of the different foundation types.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A4Q29:

Deldot has issued add #4 and with the issuance has added breakout forms; form page 1 which says install portable impact attenuator for which there is a proposal item per each and form page 2 which says furnish portable impact attenuator for which there is a bid item per each. Since there is absolutely nothing on the breakout forms what are we submitting on this form? Shouldn't you have a repair item in the proposal for portable impact attenuators?

Response to Question A4Q29:

Repairs will be paid for in accordance with Special Provisions 720532 and 720534. Note the second paragraph under 'Basis of Payment'. Because there are different types of portable impact attenuators, we have left the form blank to enable the bidder to enter the parts required for the particular brand of attenuator they are submitting.

Question A4Q28:

Addendum 4, Section 602772 under Architectural Treatment requires the panel to have a "smooth float" finish according to Section 602.17d. Our understanding is that this section refers to horizontal exposed cast surfaces. A MSE panel is cast facedown and is not exposed. Will alternative "sanded texture" finishes be acceptable, or is the requirement a smooth form finish? Please clarify.

Response to Question A4Q28:

The requirement for the finish can be a plain smooth form finish.

Question A4Q27:

Addendum #4 revised the Special Provisions for 602772, Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls, by adding a section entitled Architectural Treatment. One of the requirements is for the color of the concrete panels to match the adjacent concrete structures. Matching the color of concrete is very subjective; what one person sees is not necessarily the same as another. Using the same cement, fine aggregate, coarse aggregate, additives and concrete mix design is not a guarantee that the desired affect will be achieved. In any event, we are being told by the MSE wall manufacturers, that it would not be practical to use the same concrete materials and mix design as the ready mix supplier for the cast-in-place adjacent structures. The MSE wall manufacturers tell us that the only way to ensure similar color between plant cast concrete and redi mix concrete is to apply a stain to all of the concrete after construction. Please advise if applying a stain is acceptable and if so, what color would be acceptable?

Response to Question A4Q27:

The intent of this statement is to insure a close match between the different concrete items. Staining of the panels or the concrete items is not necessary.

Question A4Q26:

Addendum #4 re-issued the Diesel Fuel Cost Price Adjustment Option, which was contained in the Bid Submission documents. Is the contractor required to submit any similar form for the Steel Escalation Cost Price Adjustment?

Response to Question A4Q26:

No, there is no steel cost price adjustment form similar to the diesel fuel cost price adjustment option. There are, however, other time sensitive requirements described in the Special Provision 763655 - STEEL COST PRICE ADJUSTMENT.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A4Q25:

The Proposal and Special Provisions require that certain specific documents be submitted within ten (10) calendar days after the date of the bid opening. Addendum #4 has confirmed that the bid date remains as 2:00 PM on Thursday, May 26, 2011, less than just two (2) calendar days prior to a three (3) day national holiday weekend, Memorial Day. Of particular concern is the submission of all executed DBE subcontract and/or material contract agreements within the ten (10) calendar day period. As such, we request that the ten (10) calendar day requirement be extended to thirteen (13) calendar days, at least for the DBE contracts, as it will be virtually impossible to conduct any meaningful contract negotiations with DBE subcontractors and/or suppliers during that three (3) day holiday weekend as most of the nation will be enjoying the holiday.

Response to Question A4Q25:

This is a standard requirement and will remain “submitted within ten (10) calendar days after the date of the bid opening”.

Question A4Q24:

Addendum #4 revised the Special Provisions for 602772, Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls, by adding a section entitled Architectural Treatment. One of the requirements is for all panels to have a "cruciform shape", which we have been told is a proprietary shaped form that can only be supplied by one MSE wall company. In order to be able to get competitive prices from more than one MSE wall company on these materials, would DelDOT consider allowing alternate shaped panels?

Response to Question A4Q24:

The cruciform facing panel is not a proprietary shape and each manufacturer can precast different facing panel shapes for their wall systems.

Question A4Q23:

Regarding bullet #4 on the first page of the Department’s May 12, 2011 Addendum #4 cover letter, it states that “Item Number 623002, DELETED, to be removed from the Proposal.” Item #623002 is “Prestressed Reinforced Concrete Members, Box-Beams” and is for the widening of the S-8 Bridge Structure, the scope for which has not been changed.

We believe that the Department’s intent was to simply delete the Breakout sheet for this item number, which it did, and not delete this work.
Please confirm.

Response to Question A4Q23:

Item 623002 is a standard bid item with no breakout sheet or Special Provision.

Question A4Q22:

The total of the quantities for each bridge in the breakdown of the bid quantity for item 3010 provided in the supplemental bid information does not equal the quantity for that item in the schedule of items. Please clarify.

Response to Question A4Q22:

Please bid based on the quantities shown on the bid page schedule of items. Supplemental bid info was for information only.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A4Q21:

Please confirm that revised breakout sheets in excel format will be provided prior to bid. How will this information be provided to the Contractor? Website, disk or other.

Response to Question A4Q21:

Please refer to the response to question A4Q6.

Question A4Q20:

Line Number 325 (Bid Item 271000) was added by Addendum No. 4 and the Schedule of Price and Expedite File have a predetermined unit price and extension filled in for this item; this does not appear to be correct. Please advise.

Response to Question A4Q20:

The fixed cost will cover the cost of the excavation/cleanout for the pond. We will stay with a fixed price for this bid item.

Question A4Q19:

With the changes in Add #4 to include a sealer at the ends of some of the pier caps, the sealer specs states that the sealer work is to be incidental to the pertinent "Portland Cement Concrete Masonry" item. However, the Add #4 note on the plans (Sht S2-18 & S3-17) state that the sealer work is to be paid under Item 602616, "Waterproofing PCC Masonry Surfaces". It is assumed that since there is no Item 602616 shown in the Add #4 Schedule of Prices, the sealer work is incidental to the pertinent Portland Cement Concrete Masonry item. Please clarify.

Response to Question A4Q19:

The items should be incidental to the PCC Masonry items. Please note the 602616 is not a pay item. The 602616 spec states the work is incidental to the pertinent PCC Masonry item.

Question A4Q18:

On Sht 5, Project Note #23 under Section 700 states that the cost of any sheeting used for pole bases will be incidental to the respective pole base. Without knowing if this will be needed, we would have to include the cost of sheeting in the price, driving it up , and it may not be needed. If Bid Item 746555 - Pole Base Sheeting was added to the bid, this would only have to be used when required, being more cost effective.

Response to Question A4Q18:

Please bid the item as described in the plans and specifications.

Question A4Q17:

With the receipt of add #4 DelDOT added line number 3040 item 712005 rip-rap r-4. Where does the quantity of 7310 sy come from and where is that quantity used on this contract?

Response to Question A4Q17:

Please refer to typical sections sheets 9, 19, 23-27 and 30. Riprap R-4 is used in the medians in the area between barriers where it would be difficult to maintain another surface treatment.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A4Q16:

We have yet to receive answers to the questions we submitted in response to your review of our proposed phasing revisions. Will these questions be answered prior to the bid? When can we expect to receive these responses?

Response to Question A4Q16:

Please refer to the letter the Department sent in response to your phasing plan submittal. Any additional information would not occur until after the bid date.

Question A4Q15:

Your answer to question 163 did not address the issue of where you feel we will encounter the unsuitable material in our excavations. 48,234 cy is a substantial portion of the total cut for this project. Without an accounting of where you anticipate unsuitable material it is not possible for us to accurately estimate the cost of excavation for this project. With the multiple phases and potential long hauls between cuts and fills a 48,324 cy wild card thrown into the mix is a big issue that needs to be addressed.

Response to Question A4Q15:

Locations for undercut will be determined in the field as excavation occurs.

Question A4Q14:

Your response to question 214, as well as other questions on this issue, still do not address the situation where we disagree with your quantities on the breakout sheets. We are to give you unit prices based on your quantities. The lump sum price for these items must equal what we feel is the total cost of this item regardless of your quantities. Your answers on this issue dictate that in the case where we disagree with your quantity we are forced to give you an incorrect unit price such that the total price will be accurate. How will you account for this should we have to negotiate a change order due to design changes post bid?

Response to Question A4Q14:

The intent is to pay the bridge steel as a Lump Sum item. The quantities on the breakout sheet are for information only to the bidders, but should be close to the actual required.

Question A4Q13:

Your response to question 274 states the gap between the concrete fill and the ground line does not need to be filled. It would likely be cheaper to fill then to figure a way to place concrete only to the elevation shown. So the question is, is it permissible to fill this gap with concrete?

Response to Question A4Q13:

It is permissible to fill the gap with concrete as a means to form the plug of concrete; however no payment for additional concrete will be made. This is part of the means and methods used by the contractor.

Question A4Q12:

The answers to several questions in the 5/12/11 version of the Questions and Answers note that they will be answered in a future addendum. Will there be an addendum 5 and when do you anticipate it being issued?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A4Q12:

All responses to questions referring to future addendums have already been addressed in Addendums 2 through 4.

Question A4Q11:

Please issue an unlocked copy of the pdf of the last round of questions and answers.

Response to Question A4Q11:

The Department is concerned questions and their answers could mistakenly become mismatched which could result in a bidders error. As these questions and answers are included in the contract, the Department cannot comply with this request.

Question A4Q10:

Is the recent (within the past month) earth movement by others on the project site accounted for in the cross sections and/or the bid quantities? Can you tell us the nature and quantity of the material being added to or taken from the site?

Response to Question A4Q10:

The project should be bid per the quantities on the plans. The current project is ongoing and some suitable material being stockpiled could be used for the Interchange project.

Question A4Q9:

Line No.1780 Item #734013 Permanent Seeding Dry Ground

146,608 S.Y. The above item lists permanent seeding dry ground.

PGS-DG The specification is one seed mixture less than 3.1 cost \$251.75 Acre Material Cost

PGS-DG The specification is one seed mixture greater than 3.1 cost \$561.00 Acre Material Cost

The specification should be broken out seeding dry ground less than 3.1 slope one item.

The specification should be broken out seeding dry ground greater than 3.1 slope one item.

Please advise in an addendum.

I suggest on future jobs this item be listed one bid item permanent seeding dry ground greater than 3.1 slope.

The basic seeding permanent seeding dry ground would be for area's less than a 3:1 slope

Response to Question A4Q9:

All applications of permanent dry ground seeding shall be bid under item 734013.

Question A4Q8:

Add # 4 indicates there are a total of 154 sheets of construction plan changes. When opening the bid disk it shows a total of 99 sheets. Which is correct?

Response to Question A4Q8:

Addendum No. 3 was 154 pages. Addendum No. 4 is 99 pages.

Question A4Q7:

After reviewing add #4 for this project which we received late yesterday afternoon we are requesting that deldot consider extending the bid date for this contract for two weeks.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A4Q7:

Please refer to the response to question A4Q2.

Question A4Q6:

Addendum #4 item #31 states "Two (2) pages, Form Sheets, item 720532 - Install Portable Impact Attenuator and item 720534 - Furnish Portable Impact Attenuator, new, to be added to the Proposal." Seems like there were three (3) pages added. There is a new page before the form sheets that has the following statement "FORM SHEETS. The following sheets must be completed and returned within 10 calendar days by the apparent low bidder. Failure to complete the form sheets as required will result in the bid being declared non-responsive and the bid will not be considered. Form sheets must be completed regardless of whether bidding by electronic means or typewritten hard copy." Will you supply an Excel file, similar to the breakout sheets, in order for us to list the major components with quantity and unit price to equal the bid price for these items? This file needs to be unprotected, where the breakout sheets protect everything except the unit price column.

Response to Question A4Q6:

We anticipate providing a new excel breakout sheet file two days prior to the bid date or sooner if possible. This file will also include the Form Sheets. It is anticipated this file will be placed on the website at www.bids.delaware.gov.

Question A4Q5:

In the expedite section issued with add #4 says item 1510 thru 1740 were changed. What are the changes?

Response to Question A4Q5:

The changes are from Addendum 2 through Addendum 4.

Question A4Q4:

Addendum #4 changed page 33, State of Delaware prevailing wages. This page conflicts with page 34 which is also prevailing wage rates for New Castle County in Delaware. If addendum #4 page 33 are the prevailing wage rates we are to use for bidding, why are the rates for cement finishers \$2.93 lower than original rate, electrical line worker \$11.79 lower, painters \$10.05 lower and power equipment operators \$1.91 lower?

Addendum #4 did not include revised breakout sheet Excel file. When will addendum #5 be issued?

Response to Question A4Q4:

Page 33 are State of Delaware prevailing wages. Page 34 are the federal prevailing wages. Refer to page 32 "PREVAILING WAGE REQUIREMENTS" for further information.

Please refer to the response to question A3Q10 concerning the excel file.

Question A4Q3:

We request a postponement of the bid date from the currently scheduled date of May 26. We have still not received Addendum #4 and require sufficient time to review the revisions and answers that will be included in this addendum.

Response to Question A4Q3:

Please refer to the response to question A4Q2.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A4Q2:

For the referenced Project, we are requesting an extension of 2 to 3 weeks for the current bid date of May 26. The time is required to adequately prepare our bid and get subcontractors to respond to our requests, getting that information analyzed, distributed and priced will require the added time requested.

Response to Question A4Q2:

The Bid date is not extended and remains May 26, 2011.

Question A4Q1:

Please advise which revisions apply to the above referenced project. A revision dated 2/23/2010 or the Standard Specifications dated August 2001 for sections 734 seeding and 735 mulching. The addendum and bid items refer to straw mulching and that was changed per the new specifications.

Response to Question A4Q1:

This contract was advertised December 6, 2010 which means the Supplemental Specifications issued on and prior to October 12, 2010 are included in this contract, and supersede the 2001 Standard Specifications dated August 2001.

May 12, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for **new responses** through May 12, 2011;

A3Q15, A3Q10, A3Q3, A3Q2, A3Q1, 379, 372, 371, 230,
229-1, 215, 214, 187, 182, 180, 178, 88, 74, 49-1, 47

and

Questions A3Q18 through A3Q25 (Addendum 3 questions) are **new questions and responses**.

Question A3Q25:

The following is a tab of questions that remain 1) unanswered, 2) answered but response still required, and 3) answered but update only required, as of the April 6, 2011 Addendum #3 publication as well as the April 18, 2011 Q&A publication:

1. Unanswered questions: 214, 215, 229-1, 379, A3Q1, A3Q2, A3Q3, A3Q10, and A3Q15.
2. Answered questions but a response is still required: 34, 47, 49-1, 51, 67, 88, 126, 182, 187, 192, 193, 230, 250, 251, 254, 258, 262, 290, 346, 364, 368, 371, 372, 380, 389, 395, A2Q4, and A3Q14.
3. Answered questions and only an update to confirm the answers given is still required: 3, 45, 57-1, 62, 65, 74, 118, 119, 120, 178, 263, 265, 319, 321, 322, 340, 355, 358, 360, 382, 400, A3Q4, A3Q5, A3Q6, A3Q7, A3Q8, A3Q11, A3Q12, A3Q16, and A3Q17.

In addition would be any additional questions that were posted after April 6, 2011.

This question is being asked to insure that all questions will be properly addressed in a timely manner prior to the current bid date of May 26, 2011.

Response to Question A3Q25:

All questions have been answered/addressed as of May 12, 2011.

Question A3Q24:

1. What is the anticipated Notice to Proceed Date for this project based on a May 26, 2011 bid date; please advise.
2. Is the bid date still anticipated to be May 26, 2011??

Response to Question A3Q24:

The anticipated Notice to Proceed Date for this project is September 12, 2011.

The bid date remains May 26, 2011.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A3Q23:

We have received addendum # 3 concerning the above referenced project. We understand that another addendum will be issued in early May. (We have) the following question:

Will the following forms be issued with this addendum? Please advise.

- a. Payment Bond Form
- b. Performance Bond Form
- c. 1 Year Maintenance Bond Form on the reflective taping.

Response to Question A3Q23:

No, the forms will not be part of the pre-bid information.

Question A3Q22:

The new response to Q&A #378 Part 2 that was issued in conjunction with Addendum #3 advised that “If the time to order materials and perform relocations as detailed in the Utility Statement is exceeded by a Utility Company, then a non-compensable time extension will be granted if the delay affects the current CPM schedule’s critical path.”

If a Utility Company materially delays critical path work on the project, a non-compensable time extension may be unreasonable in certain scenarios. For example:

1. What if the Utility Company’s delay unnecessarily pushes time sensitive critical path work into or thru a winter that was not anticipated by the contractor?
2. What if a Utility Company’s delay unnecessarily pushes the contractor into another construction season that was not anticipated by the contractor?

If either of the above or a similar type situation would occur, the contractor will endure tremendous additional costs that will need to be recouped. Please provide further guidance on this legitimate concern.

Response to Question A3Q22:

Please refer to the responses to questions 229, 378 and the Standard Specifications. Note that the Utility Statement has been revised in Addendum 4.

Question A3Q21: cancelled

Question A3Q20:

The Department has attempted to respond to the contractor’s concern about how weather days are defined and will be treated on this “A+B” project.

In our opinion the new responses to Q&A #49-1 and #180 that were issued in conjunction with Addendum #3, coupled with prior responses to other similar questions, seems to further complicate the matter and does not provide clear and distinct guidance on how weather days will be treated or specifically what the contractor is to use in developing his pre-bid schedule. Given that the number of calendar days used by the contractor to formulate its bid could jeopardize his ability to be considered the low responsive bidder if he misinterprets the Department’s intent, as well as subject himself to unnecessary RULD’s of \$35,000/calendar day, the Department either needs to make the definition and treatment of weather days “crystal clear” to all bidders prior to the bid date or simply remove this requirement from the bidding procedure. Since the contractor must submit and obtain approval of its project CPM schedule, any “weather” or “lost” days that directly affect the critical path could simply be given to the contractor as a “no cost” change order for an extension of time. This would eliminate a tremendous amount of confusion, arguments, interpretation disputes, and/or guess work especially if the Department and the contractor interpret the contract language differently. For example, if a contractor assumes zero weather days based on the answers to the questions thus far, and is considered to be the lowest responsive bidder, how will the Department view any actual project weather or lost day incurred? Please consider this request in order to put all bidders on a level playing field.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A3Q20:

Special Bidding Procedure, Item 763564 and the Bid Proposal Form page 32 were modified in Addendum 4 to remove the entry for the proposed amount of Weather Days. The bidder must include the Weather Days derived from Table 1 under Item 763564 – Special Bidding Procedure in their calculation of Total number of calendar days. The Department will monitor the number of Weather Days that affect the Critical Path of the Schedule from the first day of work until the project is substantially completed. If the actual weather days exceed those originally determined in the Table, the contractor receives a non-compensable time extension for the number of days in excess.

Question A3Q19:

Please correct the breakout sheets 2 & 2A for item 602772 – Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls. I think there should only be one total?

Response to Question A3Q19:

Breakout sheet 2 contains items 1 - 10 and is not totaled. Breakout sheet 2A contains items 11 - 21. The total of sheets 2 and 2A is placed at the bottom of sheet 2A. In other words, the total amount entered on the bottom of sheet 2A contains all pricing for items 1 - 21.

Question A3Q18:

Please revise the bid form sheet 32. Section 002 has been deleted. Does the total bid amount for A = Section 001?

Response to Question A3Q18:

This will be corrected in Addendum 4. A = Total Bid Amount of Section 0001.

April 18, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for **new responses** through April 18, 2011;
A2Q9, 384, 375, 365, 358, 334, 320, 312, 235, 124-1, 111, 57-1

Questions A3Q1 through A3Q17 (Addendum 3 questions) are new questions and responses.

Question A3Q17:

Similar to Question 214 for which we await a response, if there are no changes to the work shown on the drawings for the construction of Item 605757, High Performance (HPS-70W) Steel, at Bridge S6 and the actual quantity of HPS-70W is 78,000 LB as compared to the 175,000 LB Breakout Sheet quantity, how will this affect the payment that the contractor is to receive? Will the contractor in this case be paid as if the Breakout Sheet quantity of 175,000 LB was the actual quantity?

Response to Question A3Q17:

In addition to the flanges the cross girder is also High Performance Steel (see sheet 472) and was included in the estimate. Please note that the 175,000 lbs currently shown in the breakout sheet for S-6 will be revised to 182,000 lbs, and the breakout sheet will be re-issued as part of Addendum 4.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A3Q16:

Please refer to the response to Question 315 regarding the locations where High Performance Steel (HPS-70W) is to be used for S6. The response does not fully answer the question, namely that only the top and bottom flanges (not the web) of the girders (for a distance shown on the drawings to be 38 feet each side of Pier 2) are to be HPS-70W Steel. The reason that we ask this question, is that we do not see how the quantity of 175,000 LB which is shown on Breakout Sheet-13, was determined and in fact we believe the quantity as shown on the drawings is less than half of that amount. In order for DelDOT to have meaningful breakout sheets, we must be able to confirm the quantities on those sheets.

Response to Question A3Q16:

The response to Q315 was specific to the question asked regarding to the flanges. In addition to the flanges the cross girder is also High Performance Steel (see sheet 472) and was included in the estimate. Please note that the 175,000 lbs currently shown in the breakout sheet for S-6 will be revised to 182,000 lbs, and the breakout sheet will be re-issued as part of Addendum 4.

Question A3Q15:

The response to Question 338 regarding the method of payment for undercutting excavation at structures does not agree with the response to Question 249 or to Special Provision 602772 which was revised by Addendum No. 3 to help clarify this issue. Please verify, which I believe was DelDOT's intent, that only undercut excavation for pier or sign foundation structures would be paid for as indicated under Section 207.07.

Response to Question A3Q15:

Undercut for structures shall be paid for as indicated under Section 207.07 unless otherwise noted in the plans or Special Provisions. Accordingly, undercut for piers and sign foundations would be paid for under item 207000.

Note; Undercut for MSE Walls shall be paid for under Item 212000 as per Special Provision 602772.

Question A3Q14:

The questions about the MSE architectural finish (if any) have not been addressed.

Response to Question A3Q14:

This issue is being addressed in Addendum 4 as a revision to special provision 602772.

Question A3Q13:

Several Q&A's deal with the single face barrier being paid under Item 720529. This was reflected on the plan sheets, but no item has been added to the special provisions or proposal.

Response to Question A3Q13:

Item 720529 is the correct Item Number. The plans were updated in Addendum 3 to reflect the change. The Special Provision had the correct item number originally so there was no need to change the Special Provision.

Question A3Q12:

Item 207501 has been removed from the proposal, but the breakout sheet for the item (207501) remains.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A3Q12:

The item has been removed. The break out sheets will be removed.

Question A3Q11:

Several Q&A's deal with the breakout sheet for Item 623002 not being required, but the special provision still says it is required.

Response to Question A3Q11:

Sheet 188 in the Special provisions will be removed.

Question A3Q10:

Add #3 changed the breakout sheets. Can the excel breakout sheet file be issued again?

Response to Question A3Q10:

Yes, we anticipate providing a new excel breakout sheet file two days prior to the bid date or sooner if possible.

Question A3Q9:

Please find listed below a question from Addendum No. 3 for the above referenced project:
The original Schedule of Prices and Addendum No. 2 designated Items for Line Numbers 2960 thru 3030 as Fixed Quantities items.
The Schedule of Prices in Addendum No. 3 does NOT list any Items as Fixed Quantities. Please confirm that the contract does not contain any Fixed Quantities items.

Response to Question A3Q9:

The contract does not contain any fixed quantity items.

Question A3Q8:

Addendum 3 attempted to clarify how the construction of moment slabs was to be paid by labeling of the moment slab and barrier above and adding Item 602017 in parentheses () on drawings R2-1, R7-01 (actually Item 602117) & R10-01 to each. There is no Special Provision for Item 602017, it is called "Portland Cement Concrete Masonry, Parapet, Class A" by the Schedule of Items, listed the same way in the List of Standard Construction Items and there is no mention of a moment slab in the August 2001 Standard Specifications. Please verify that the volume of concrete used to construct the moment slab will be paid under Item 602017, Portland Cement Concrete Masonry, Parapet, Class A and that the moment slab is not incidental to the parapet.

Response to Question A3Q8:

Sheets R7-01 incorrectly labeled the concrete in the moment slab as 602117. It should read 602017 and will be updated in Addendum #4. Item 602017 is a cubic yard item and it does include the moment slab concrete.

Question A3Q7:

Please refer to Addendum 3 Drawings R5-01 and R7-01 with reference to the Typical Sections where PCC Barrier/F-Shape Barrier is shown as being paid under Item 602117. There is no Item 602117 in the Schedule of Items; should the Item be changed to 602017, which would be the same as at the other MSE Walls?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A3Q7:

The item should read 602017 and will be corrected in Addendum 4.

Question A3Q6:

Addendum No. 3 Bridge Drawings S1-2, S2-2, S3-2, S4-2 and S5-2 all still contain the General Note "no slip-forming of barriers is permitted, unless otherwise approved." Addendum 3 Bridge Drawing S6-2 deleted a similar General Note "no slip-forming of parapets is permitted." Addendum 3 Bridge Drawing S8-2 General Note 3 still says "no slip-forming of parapets is permitted." These notes are inconsistent with the answers to Questions 119 and 120 which say "DelDOT has decided that slip forming will be permitted on this project. The plans will be updated accordingly by (in an) addendum." Please clarify.

Response to Question A3Q6:

The note will be removed from these sheets in Addendum 4.

Question A3Q5:

Addendum #3 issued revised Breakout Sheets for Bid Item #602772, MSE Walls, which eliminated line items for the MSE Walls at all of the six (6) new bridges, namely S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, & S6. Where are we to put our pricing for the MSE Walls at these six (6) bridges?

Response to Question A3Q5:

The walls in question were inadvertently removed from the updated Addendum 3 breakout sheets. The Breakout sheets will be updated and re-issued in Addendum 4.

Question A3Q4:

Addendum #3 did not change the anticipated NTP of June 13, 2011 despite a revised bid date of May 26, 2011. How is this possible?

Response to Question A3Q4:

The anticipated NTP was revised in the response to Question 178. It will also be placed on the addendum 4 sheet when issued.

Question A3Q3:

Item 3 of Addendum No. 3 is intended to delete Special Provisions, 207501 - Sheeting and Shoring from the Proposal. Referring to Subsection 207.03 Excavation, of the Supplemental Specifications to the August 2001 Standard Specifications (Revised October 12, 2010), "The cost of shoring shall be incidental to item 207000 - Excavation and Backfill for Structures" and referring to Subsection 207.07 Basis of Payment of the August 2001 Standard Specifications "Price and payment will constitute full compensation for excavation ...for placing sheeting and shoring ..."

Although Line No. 80, Item 207501 Sheeting and Shoring was eliminated from page 1 of the Bid Proposal Form, Breakout Sheet-1, Item 207501 - Sheeting and Shoring was not.

A conflict now exists between the Standard Specifications, the Supplemental Specifications, the Bid Proposal Form and Breakout Sheet-1. Please clarify the intent.

Response to Question A3Q3:

The Breakout Sheet for item 207501 has been removed in Addendum 4.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question A3Q2:

Please refer to Item 18 of Addendum No. 3 and notice that there is information missing pertaining to which section and pages of the Special Provisions are to be revised. Please provide the missing information.

Response to Question A3Q2:

Item 18 was a place holder that should have been deleted. It did not represent any revised pages.

Question A3Q1:

Please note that Item 3 of Addendum No. 3, concerning Special Provisions, 207501 - Sheeting and Shoring, says that page 56 is DELETED and to be removed from the Proposal. I believe that the correct page should be 54.

Response to Question A3Q1:

The correct page is 56.

April 6, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for **new responses** through April 6, 2011;
28, 33, 35, 36, 39, 49-1, 53, 54, 72, 73-1, 87, 106, 112, 134, 145, 149-152, 155-163, 167, 177, 178,
178-1, 180, 225, 226, 227, 232, 234, 236, 239, 248-309, 311, 313-319, 322-328, 330, 331, 332, 333, 336,
338, 339, 340, 341, 345-349, 353-357, 359-362, 364, 366, 367, 368, 369, 371, 372, 373, 374, 376, 377,
378, 380, 381, 382, 385-390, 392-402

Questions A2Q1 through A2Q9 (Addendum 2 questions) are new questions and responses.

Question A2Q9:

Addendum #2 changed the MSE Wall backfill in the reinforcement zones at Walls #R2, #R3, and #R16 from "LWEF" to "CLSM".

Addendum #2 also clarified the material outside of the reinforcement zone at Wall #R16 to either "CLSM" or Type "F" depending on the location.

In the Breakout Sheets for Item #602772, MSE Walls, there is a quantity of 2,834 CY labeled as "Wall 16 Lightweight Fill in Straps".

1. Is the description of the material in the Breakout sheets still correct?
2. Is this quantity of 2,834 CY intended to be within or outside of the reinforcement zone?
3. Since Addendum #2 did not modify this quantity yet the limits were modified, is this quantity still accurate?
4. Walls #R2 & #R3 also call for CLSM but there are no Breakout sheet line item for this work. Is that the intent?

Response to Question A2Q9:

The breakout sheets are updated in addendum three. The walls will no longer have quantity breakdowns and should be bid as lump sum.

Question A2Q8:

Addendum #2 updated the Quarantine Period of the MSE Walls at all Bridge and the numbered "R" Walls with the exception of MSE Wall #R7 and in particular sheet #559. For this wall the Foundation

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Note still states that "A QUARANTINE PERIOD OF APPROXIMATELY" 30-DAYS IS REQUIRED..." The word "approximately" was removed from all other numbered "R" Walls via Addendum #2 except MSE Wall #R7. Please advise if this note will also be modified.

Response to Question A2Q8:

The word approximately will be removed from R7 in Addendum 3.

Question A2Q7:

Referring to Addendum No. 2, Spec Sections 619501 - Production Pile Restrike and Section 619502 - Test Pile Restrike:

Questions:

- A. It appears that the new spec requires restrikes on 36 production piles, 6 per structure * 6 structures and that these are to be performed at no cost to the department. Is that correct?
- B. Does the initial strike of these production piles require dynamic testing?
- C. Does the restrike of these production piles require dynamic testing?
- D. The spec indicates that some production piles are designated to be dynamically tested? Where is that designation?
- E. If there is dynamic pile testing incidental to the production piles, how will it be paid?
- F. Could this spec be rewritten so that it is clear what is required?

Response to Question A2Q7:

- A. This is correct, the total number of restrikes to be performed at no additional cost to the department is 36.
- B. No, unless the production pile is designated as a test pile.
- C. No, unless the production pile is designated as a test pile.
- D. The test pile locations are indicated in the plans, see sheets, 198, 210, 257, 269, 310, 322, 352, 367, 397, 410, 452, 463.
- E. The requirements for dynamic testing are covered under SP 619519 & 619539. Those production piles specified in the plans as test piles are to be paid as test piles.
- F. The total number of test piles is included in the plans and the bid proposal, the requirements for testing are covered in the special provisions 619519 & 619539, the number of restrikes and how they will be paid is covered in the special provisions 619501/619502.

Question A2Q6:

Re. Dwg. 19, I-95 Shifted, Sta. 1703+82.15 to 1712+02.65. "X" Item 712005 – RipRap, R-4 Item 712005 appears to be missing from the Bid Items.

- (A) Will a Bid Item be created for this RipRap ?
- (B) If not, how will the designated RipRap be paid ?

Response to Question A2Q6:

These questions are addressed in addendum 3.

Question A2Q5:

Please refer to the response to Question 147, concerning the depth of piezometers, which says "Plan Sheet No. 194A will be updated by addendum to include depth of installation" and Plan Sheet No. 194A which was re-issued as part of Addendum 2. I still can not find the depth of the piezometers on Sheet No. 194A which is referred to by the response to Question 147. Please provide the necessary information.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A2Q5:

The depth is 30-ft for all piezometers and is addressed in Addendum 3, sheet 194A. Addendum 2 just added the special provision section numbers to the plan notes.

Question A2Q4:

Regarding the implementation of sealer limits to the ends of the concrete pier caps for S2 Pier 2 and S3 Pier 1, what are the spec requirements of the sealer itself? Are the limits of the sealer to extend the full height of the pier caps.

Response to Question A2Q4:

A special provision for the sealer will be included by addendum. The sealer is to extend the full height of the caps.

Question A2Q3:

Please refer to the response to Question 134, which says "response forthcoming" and to the Retaining Wall drawing sheets that were provided as part of Addendum 2 and be advised that an additional response is needed.

Please explain why Item 602017, PCC Masonry, Parapet, Class A, which appears on the re-issued Retaining Wall Plans for R5, R9, R10, R12, R13, R14 & R15 does not appear as one of the "Pay Items" on R1, R2 & R3 which were added by Addendum 2.

Unless the intent is to issue another addendum and delete Item 602017, PCC Masonry, Parapet, Class A from the Retaining Wall Plans for R5, R9, R10, R12, R13, R14 & R15 and pay for the "Barrier" by adding Item 602773, PCC Masonry for Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls to the Plans for R9, R10, R12, R13, R14 & R15 (which would be consistent with the Special Provisions for Item 602773), the Addendum 2 revisions to the Retaining Wall Plans make it now more confusing than before as to which bid item the "Barrier" work is to be included.

Please clarify.

Response to Question A2Q3:

All of the barriers and moment slabs on retaining walls are paid for under 602017. Item numbers will be updated under Addendum 3.

Question A2Q2 :

Revised sheet R16-01 shows CLSM in the wedge behind the CLSM in the reinforcement area. Is the geotextile still required between the CLSM areas?

Response to Question A2Q2:

Geotextile is not required between the similar materials.

Question A2Q1:

Revised sheet R16-01 shows Type F Borrow to be placed on top of the CLSM. Will payment for this material be done under Bid item #209006 or is it incidental to the construction of retaining wall #16?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question A2Q1:

Per the Measurement and Payment section of Specification 602772, Type F Borrow will not be considered incidental to the MSE Wall Item. Payment will be made under Item 209006.

February 25, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for new responses through February 25;
47, 88, 89, 107, 108, 153, 164-166, 168, 169, 181-188, 190-203, 207-213, 216-224, 233, 237, 238,
241-245, 329, 342, 343, 350, 351, 352, 363, 370, 391

Please see follow-up questions and responses for Questions 49-1, 57-1, 73-1, 131-1, 178-1, 229-1.

Questions 246 through 402 are new questions and responses.

Question 402:

Re. Dwg. 182, 184, & 185; Special Provisions, P. 196 & 200

- (A) How does the **4" Dia. Perforated Underdrain** behind the barrier get paid?
- (B) How does the **No. 57 Stone** behind the barrier get paid?
- (C) Does the **Geotextile** just go beneath the bottom of the No. 57 Stone or does it also cover the outside face and top of the No. 57 Stone?
- (D) How does the **Geotextile** get paid?
- (E) What is the **required spacing** for the **4" Dia. Underdrain Outlet Tee** thru the barrier face and/or into the drainage inlets?

Response to Question 402:

These questions are addressed in Addendum No 3.

Question 401:

Re. Dwg. 184 & 185; Special Provisions, P. 200

How does the barrier **Waterproofing Membrane** get paid?

Response to Question 401:

This question is addressed in Addendum No 3.

Question 400:

Re. Typical Sections, Dwg. 6, SR1 from Sta. 360+75.57 to Sta. 373+28.91

- (A) Does the proposed PCC Pavement need to be **Doweled** into the existing PCC Pavement?
- (B) If it requires **Dowels**, can you provide a detail showing spacing & dowel size?
- (C) How will the **Dowels** get paid?

Response to Question 400:

The following note will added to the plans in Addendum No. 4 - Where proposed PCC pavement is to be poured adjacent to existing PCC pavement, the proposed pavement shall be doweled to the existing pavement. Construction and placement of the dowels shall be in accordance with the standard details for PCC pavement and patching. All cost associated with the construction of the dowels shall be included in the cost of Item 501006 PCC Pavement, 12".

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 399:

Re. Dwg. 78 & 724, I-95 SB Sta. 118+00; and Note 1 Modify Exist. Overhead Sign (190'L)(Dwg. 78, Sta. 118+00):

- (A) Does the **Overhead Sign** get Modified or Removed?
- (B) If modified, can you provide the modification details?

Response to Question 399:

The OH sign is to be removed. The plans were updated in Addendum 3.

Question 398:

Re. Dwg. 69, Ramp "A" Station 1260+00, Existing Bridge Demolition

Do the **Existing Bridge Footings** which are below the proposed elevations need to be broken up or can they remain intact?

Response to Question 398:

This is addressed in Addendum 3, Sheet 4, Note 4.

Question 397:

Re. Line Item No. 1620. ; 720567 Furnish And Maintain Portable P.C.C. Safety Barrier; Special Provisions, P. 209, Method of Measurement and Basis of Payment

Does this item also include the **final offsite removal** of the barrier?

Response to Question 397:

Yes, the removal of the barrier at the end of the project shall be included in the price bid per linear foot bid for the item. No additional compensation shall be awarded for the removal.

Question 396:

Sheet 194A details the Settlement Platform, could a detail be provided for the Settlement Monuments?

Response to Question 396:

Settlement monuments are surface points constructed of material specified in Special Provision 202518 - Settlement Monument.

Question 395:

Sheet 5; the excavation summary shows 348,317 CY of excavation from the cross sections and soil stockpiles. The amount of excavation that meets Type F Borrow is only 233,202 CY. Where is the material located which does not meet the Type F Borrow specification?

Response to Question 395:

The Earthwork Summary shown on sheet 5 will be updated as part of Addendum 4. Unsuitable material was estimated as a percentage of the overall excavated material based on the geo-technical investigation. The actual volume of unsuitable material may vary based on actual field conditions.

Question 394:

What is the Traffic Control expected for the bridge demolition? Specifically, will a shutdown of SR 7 SB be allowed for the bridge demolition?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 394:

Lane closures and detours will be subject to the Traffic Restrictions shown on Sheet 638.

Question 393:

Specification Pages 31 and 32 indicate the State of Delaware and Federal Prevailing Wages. In both cases there is no fringe indicated. Is this correct?

Response to Question 393:

The prevailing wages shown include both wages and fringes. Refer to section III paragraph I for the [Delaware Department of Labor](#) definition, and the U.S. Department of Labor's [Fact Sheet 66](#).

Question 392:

Is Bid Item 602017 Barriers used for any barrier work beside that barrier at the bridges as shown on the drawings for S1- through S6 and S8? If so, where else is it used.

Response to Question 392:

Item number 602017 is used on all bridge barriers, moment slabs and barriers and the PCC barrier on MSE walls.

Question 391:

In light of the recently enacted federal regulation designed to reduce burdens on DBE's seeking certification in more than one state, would DelDOT consider applying Section 26.85(b) to this project in order to fast-track the certification of out-of-state DBE's prior to the bid date for this project in order to increase the available pool of certified DBE's for purposes of achieving the 10% DBE goal on this large project?

Response to Question 391:

Yes, the new regulations are mandatory effective January 1, 2012, and states may implement compliance on February 28, 2011. The Department will issue changes to our DBE program encompassing the new requirements when we post the change on our website, which is expected to occur early March 2011. However, be aware there is no "fast-track" processing of out of state certification requests other than decreasing our previous 90 day maximum processing time to 60 days. It is our policy to process each application in the order it has been received and determined to be complete. As a reminder, proposed DBE firms must be certified by the Department at the time of bid in order to count towards meeting the DBE goal. If individual firms have questions regarding processing time, they should contact our DBE office at (302) 760-2035.

Question 390:

What is the typical section of item 211523, removal of pcc barrier?

Response to Question 390:

The contractor(s) is advised that it is his/her responsibility to obtain as-built plans of the different barrier(s) to be removed and base their unit price (per linear foot) accordingly.

Question 389:

The Earthwork Summary on the plans does not appear to be exactly in sync with all the bid quantities. Can you please clarify?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 389:

The earthwork Summary will be updated by addendum.

Question 388:

Sheet #'s 62 & 63: B-1 & B-2 are shown as bifurcated barrier Ty-1 (720651). Grades & Geometrics provide the grades for one side of this barrier. Please provide the grades for the opposite side of this barrier.

Response to Question 388:

Elevations along the southbound SR7 face of barrier are to be set in the field based on the actual elevations of the existing the southbound roadway and the cross-slope information provided on the typical sections.

Question 387:

Sheet #64: Please review the barrier series = B-08(347').....B-10(80').....B-11(541'). This series is SFTy-2Mod(720655).....SFTy-4Mod(720657).....SFTy-2Mod(720655). WHERE does each specific barrier START at?

Response to Question 387:

This information is provided on sheet 25 of Addendum 3.

Question 386:

Sheet #'s 76 & 158: B-109 & 108. Grades and Geometrics seem to only provide data for Ramp B. Is grade data available for S/B I-95 adjacent to B-109 & B-108 (ie. the bifurcated face)?

Response to Question 386:

Elevations along the southbound I-95 face of barrier are to be set based on the actual field conditions.

Question 385:

Sheet #184: Section A-A has the footing at 2'-0" deep, Section B-B has the footing at 1'-0" deep, and the typical section for the Type 1 bifurcated has the footing at 0'-8" deep. Please clarify how deep these footings are and/or where any steps in the footing take place?

Response to Question 385:

Refer to the plan view of the Transition. The step in footing depth from 2' to 1' occurs at the dashed line where the barriers become one section. The Type 1 footing depth was modified by a plan revision included in Addendum 2 to 1'-0".

Question 384:

Please refer to the SR 1 MOT drawing for Phase 6 in the area of SR 7 NB Sta.637+00, where the western most footing and column of Pier 2 is to be constructed during this Phase (see attached). The construction of this structure projects into the permanent SR 7 NB roadway, which was previously constructed during Phase 2. The closest distance between the edge of the adjacent travel lane and edge of footing, when scaled from the supplemental DGN files of the MOT plans provided by the Department, is less than 3 feet.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

There is not enough clearance between the edge of the traffic and the proposed structure to safely build this structure as indicated. In addition, reconstruction of a portion of the SR 7 NB roadway after construction of the pier will be necessary but does not appear to be addressed and we can find no accommodations made in the MOT plans in the way of any Portable P.C.C. Safety Barrier, Portable Impact Attenuators, Temporary Markings or traffic phasing at this location for this condition.

Response to Question 384:

The construction of the pier can be accommodated with a slight shift of traffic (6') onto the shoulder of NB SR7. Portable PCC Safety barrier would be required to protect the work area in this location.

Question 383: cancelled

Question 382:

There is a discrepancy on the casing size with respect to the shaft size in Special Provisions 60550, 605523, 602774.

In section C (Casing) under the Materials it states that "The inside diameter of casing shall not be less than the specified sized of the shaft," while section K-4 under the Construction Methods states that "When casing is used, the outside diameter of the casing shall not be less than the shaft diameter shown on the plans." Please clarify which statement the Department will require the contractor to follow.

Response to Question 382:

Section K-4 of the special provisions will be updated by addendum to match Section C.

Question 381:

Please reference Plan Sheet S8-12. Under which bid item will the end diaphragm concrete, continuity diaphragm concrete and intermediate diaphragm concrete be paid for?

Response to Question 381:

The diaphragms will be paid for under item 602013. General note 3 on Sheet S8-2 is revised in addendum 3.

Question 380:

Please reference Plan Sheet S8-6. Plan dimensions are shown for the new construction, but I can't find any elevations or vertical dimensions necessary to quantify the work. Please provide the necessary vertical dimensions or advise me where I can find them.

Response to Question 380:

Additional elevations/vertical dimensions will be added to the plans in addendum 4.

Question 379:

Note #1 under "GENERAL NOTES" on the fourth page of the Utility Statement states the following: "THE UTILITIES AND THEIR CONTRACTORS DO NOT NORMALLY WORK ON WEEKENDS OR LEGAL HOLIDAYS".

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Under “Delmarva Power (Electric Distribution)” it states at the top of the fourth paragraph that “This will include nights and weekend work”. It then goes onto to provide durations that Delmarva Power requires in calendar days”.

1. Can we assume that the number of “calendar days” specified for Delmarva Power includes nights and weekend work? Will they work a 7 day work week if and as necessary especially since the Utility Statement also states that “No outages will be permitted during the months of July and August” and that “Outages may be restricted in September in the event of hot weather”? If not, please clarify their work schedule.
2. For all other Utilities involved in this project, should we assume that they will work weekends and nights as well if and as necessary? If not, please clarify their work schedule.

Response to Question 379:

The contractor shall coordinate with the Utility as needed. Please refer to the responses to questions 229, 378 and the Standard Specifications. Note that the Utility Statement has been revised in Addendum 4.

Question 378:

On the fourth page of the “Utility Statement” under “Delmarva Power (Electric Distribution)”, it states the following:

“Lead-Time for Cable and Associated Materials (16-23 Weeks).

“The lead time to procure these materials could possibly increase due to the economic situation and suppliers eliminating shifts.”

1. When should we assume that DelDOT will authorize Delmarva to purchase the necessary materials?
2. Can we assume that if the lead time to procure these materials exceeds 16-23 weeks that the contractor will be granted a time extension if Delmarva’s work falls on the critical path?

Response to Question 378:

1. The utility statement lists the utility contacts and instructs the contractor to call them. The final plans that the utility companies need to get started come to the Utilities Engineer from DelDOT’s Contract Administration with an advertisement notice. If this project has been advertised then the plans have been distributed and the utility companies can order materials.
2. If the time to order materials and perform relocations as detailed in the Utility Statement is exceeded by a Utility Company, then a non-compensable time extension will be granted if the delay affects the current CPM schedule’s critical path.

Question 377:

Please verify that a minimum 7-day quarantine period in addition to a quarantine period of 30 to 60 days is NOT required at MSE Walls where the full height is less than or equal to the “Max. Fill Height – Stage 1”.

Response to Question 377:

If the fill height required to fully construction the MSE wall is less than the "max. fill height - stage 1", then the 7-day quarantine period does not apply.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 376:

Sheet S6-18 shows the details of the reinforcing steel and concrete fill for the pipe piles at structure S-6. The length of reinforcement and concrete fill detailed at this structure is significantly less than detailed at the balance of the bridges. Please confirm that the details shown on Sheet S6-18 are correct.

Response to Question 376:

The details on S6-18 have been verified and adequately handle the required design loads.

Question 375:

The Utility Statement that is provided in the contract documents does not appear to indicate in which category any of the utility work is classified.

For example, is it: 1) PRIOR, 2) RESTRICTIVE, 3) CONCURRENT, or 4) COORDINATED?

Given that this is an “A” + “B” project it would be helpful to know how the Department categorizes the Utility Work.

Response to Question 375:

This language is not typical of a DelDOT contract thus we do not have an answer. All Utility work should be coordinated with utility companies as per the project plans, estimate and specs.

Question 374:

The MSE Abutment Wall quarantine period for Bridge S6 is a minimum of approximately 60 days per page S6-14 under “FOUNDATION NOTES”.

- A. Please confirm that the 60 day duration is correct as the quarantine period for this bridge is unique to all other walls on this project.
- B. Please confirm that this and all quarantine periods given in the contract documents are calendar days.

Response to Question 374:

- A. Bridge S6 requires a 60 day quarantine period per plan sheet 461. This was addressed in Addendum No. 2.
- B. Quarantine periods are in calendar days.

Question 373:

One of the notes under “FOUNDATION NOTES” found on the applicable structure drawings for the MSE Walls at the Abutments ‘A’ & ‘B’ Walls for S1, S2, S3, S4, & S5, states:

“A MINIMUM 7-DAY QUARANTINE PERIOD SHALL BE REQUIRED AFTER CONSTRUCTION OF THE WALL TO THE “MAX. FILL HEIGHT – STAGE 1” INDICATED ON THE SOIL PROFILE SECTION. NO FURTHER FILL SHALL BE PLACED UNTIL AUTHORIZED BY THE ENGINEER. ONCE AUTHORIZATION IS GIVEN, FILL SHALL BE PLACED IN ADDITIONAL INCREMENTS OF 5 FEET IN HEIGHT, WITH THE SAME QUARANTINE PERIOD AND AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED AT EACH INCREMENT. AN ADDITIONAL QUARANTINE PERIOD OF 30 TO 60 DAYS IS REQUIRED AFTER CONSTRUCTION OF THE MSE WALL TO ITS FULL HEIGHT. NO FURTHER CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE PERMITTED UNTIL AUTHORIZED BY THE ENGINEER. A TOTAL ESTIMATED SETTLEMENT OF APPROXIMATELY FOUR (4) TO FIVE (5) INCHES IS ANTICIPATED.”

- A. Does this same specific requirement also pertain to either Bridge Structure S6 and/or to any of Walls R1 thru R16?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- B. Please confirm that we are to wait a minimum of 7 calendar days between each five (5) foot increment.
- C. Since this is an "A+B" project and therefore our bid is based on time, which timeframe should use when preparing our bid schedule; the minimum, the maximum, or other?

Response to Question 373:

- A. There are no additional requirements beside what is currently shown on the plans.
- B. Each 5 foot increment, after the initial construction stage, requires a 7 day quarantine period.
- C. The quarantine periods have been revised in Addendum 2, the contractor shall refer to the addended plans to base the timeframe in preparing the bid.

Question 372:

For joint venture bidding, the certification page, top of page, after the words "The undersigned bidders" does not allow enough space for entering two company names, their addresses and telephone numbers for the joint venture. However, the second page is setup for entering information for both companies of the joint venture. Please advise.

Response to Question 372:

~~A revised certification page will be available to all planholders.~~

New Response to Question 372:

A revised joint venture certification page is available on the Addendum 4 disc.

Question 371:

For joint venture bidding, the bid bond top of page after the words "KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS That" is not setup for entering information for two companies for the joint venture. However, the middle of the page is setup for entering information for both companies of the joint venture.

Response to Question 371:

~~A revised certification page will be available to all planholders.~~

New Response to Question 371:

A revised joint venture bid bond page is available on the Addendum 4 disc.

Question 370:

Currently the deadline for questions is noon on Thursday, February 24, 2011. The "Bid Date Notice" received yesterday, February 18, 2011, specifically states in the second paragraph that "As a reminder, no technical questions will be accepted after noon on February 24th, 2011".

Given that there are still numerous unanswered questions as well as the fact that any upcoming addenda will most likely provide many changes to the specifications, plans, bid items, and/or answers to contractor's questions, the deadline for "new" questions needs to be extended proportionately to the revised bid date once said revised bid date is established. "New" questions could be defined as any questions as a result of new addenda (beginning with Addendum #2) and/or questions and answers posted after February 18, 2011.

Please advise what the revised deadline (time and date) for "new" questions will be.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 370:

Each addendum issued will include the cut-off date for questions pertaining to that addendum. Direct follow-up questions to Department responses will be accepted for up to two calendar weeks after the Department's response is posted, or until one week prior to the bid date, whichever occurs first.

Question 369:

What phase of construction is wall #8 to be completed? The MOT Phase 3 shows the line for the wall to be completed, but no roadwork behind the wall is shown to be completed during Phase 3. During Phases 4 - 6, the wall is not shown on the MOT drawings. Please clarify.

Response to Question 369:

Retaining wall number 8 was intended to be constructed in Phase 3 to provide the support of embankment required to construct Ramp G1 as shown on the attached drawing and noted in the MOT sequencing notes on sheet 641. The line work for the wall was inadvertently clipped (CADD issue) and did not transfer to the preceding phase 4-6 due to its proximity to the SB SR 7 line work completed in Phase 7.

Question 368:

The reinforcement straps and associated backfill overlap each other at the following walls:

Wall #1 & 9
Wall #14 & 15

Does this overlap effect the design and construction of these walls?

The overlap of the backfill and reinforcement straps leads to some confusion to the necessity of the proposed geotextile that is to be installed behind each wall. Will the geotextile still be required? If so, how should it be incorporated into the work?

Response to Question 368:

This will be addressed by addendum. The following note will be added to the typical MSE wall sections for RW1, RW9, RW14, and RW15. The installation of the geotextile will not be required behind the wall as shown in the typical section for the length of wall where the soil reinforcing length overlap. All other locations, the geotextile shall be installed as shown in the typical section.

Question 367:

With respect to all of the MSE Walls, there are callouts at Walls R1, R2, R3 and at the Abutments 'A' & 'B' Walls at S1, S2, S3, S4, & S5 that refer to "MAX. FILL HEIGHT - STAGE 1".

1. Does the phrase "STAGE 1" refer to the Traffic Control phasing or 'other' as there is no obvious definition? If 'other', please define what that is.
2. What is the reason that Walls R4 thru R16 and S6 do not have this same callout? Please clarify.

Response to Question 367:

1. Stage 1 is the maximum fill height for the initial placement of backfill and has nothing to do with the traffic phasing.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

2. There is no need for staged construction for RW4 to RW16 or S6. These MSE walls can be built to full height before the quarantine period starts.

Question 366:

S1-14, Foundation notes indicate that a total estimated settlement of approximately 4 to 5 inches is anticipated. If the MSE walls are installed to the planned top of wall and the MSE wall settles 5", what is your expectation for how the contractor will correct for that 5" of settlement when constructing the coping, pile cap, backwall, etc.? Do you anticipate a cast-in-place concrete adjustment to achieve the planned top of MSE wall?

Do you anticipate that the MSE wall will be built high in anticipation of the settlement and then be trimmed to the planned top of wall elevation? Do you have some other expectation of the contractor will deal with the settlement.

The same situation will exist with the MSE walls separate from the bridges with regard to paving grades, moment slab grades and coping grades.

Response to Question 366:

The specifications require that the contractor build the walls to the line, grades and dimensions shown on the plans. Where not shown on the plans the Contractor should refer to the Geotechnical Reports, made available by the Department, for a discussion of the estimated settlement. In Section 602772 - Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls and under Design Requirements it is noted that working drawings and design calculations shall include (one of four items specified):

Complete details of all elements required for the proper construction of the system, including complete material specifications.

In the same section under Construction Methods it is stated:

The selected MSE wall manufacturer shall provide a representative on site at the outset of the wall construction and periodically throughout construction of the wall and at the direction of the Engineer. The wall manufacturer's representative shall be present at a pre-construction conference to provide an overview of the wall system and a detailed construction procedure to the contractor and the Engineer.

Based on the contract documents the Contractor is responsible for developing his means and methods, in consultation with the MSE wall manufacturer, for constructing the walls to the lines, grades and dimensions shown on the plans.

Question 365:

Drawing S1-4, Note 4 states - Upon completion of the MSE Wall, there shall be a 30 to 60 day quarantine period prior to driving the abutment piles to allow for settlement and to minimize the downdrag forces that might develop on the piles.

Drawing S1-14 Foundation Notes say in part - A minimum 7 day quarantine period shall be required after construction of the wall to the "Max. Fill height - stage 1" indicated on the profile section. . . . Fill shall be placed in additional increments of 5 feet in height, with the same quarantine period. . . . An additional quarantine period of 30 to 60 days is required after the construction of the MSE wall to its fill height.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In order to complete the MSE wall to its full height it is necessary to construct the abutment and backwalls (reinforcing straps for the MSE wall attach to the back face of the pile cap and backwall), however, the abutment piles cannot be installed until the end of the final quarantine period.

Please more fully explain your intention for the construction sequence at the abutments.

Response to Question 365:

In order to attain the required fill height for quarantine purposes, a number of options are available to the contractor, such as the construction of a temporary wall to support temporary fill over the area of the abutment. It is the contractor's responsibility to determine the means and methods to be used to obtain the required fill height during the quarantine period. The final option shall be included in the contractor's working drawings in consultation with the MSE Wall Manufacturer.

Question 364:

Please provide a Low Level Lighting Foundation schedule similar to the High Mast Lighting Foundation schedule shown on sheet LI-24 (704 of 803).

Response to Question 364:

Tables for the low level lights will be created and added to the plans in a future addendum.

Question 363:

Please provide the minimum insurance requirements for this project as we cannot find any reference to the required insurances either in the Special Provisions or in the 2001 Standard Specifications.

Response to Question 363:

Delaware Code § 6929 requires each successful bidder to purchase adequate insurance for the performance of the contract. The Department has no specifications beyond this requirement.

Question 362:

Structure S6, sheet No. 478 & 479. Please provide table for span lengths, plate lengths & top flange stress zones. These are missing but provided on structures S1 thru S5.

Response to Question 362:

A table providing the requested information is added to the plans in addendum 3.

Question 361:

Will payment for excavation necessary for the installation of the temporary paving be made under Item #202000?

Response to Question 361:

Additional excavation required for the installation of temporary roadways will be paid for under Item 202000.

Question 360:

Must all areas affected by the installation of temporary paving that are outside of the limits of permanent new roadways be restored to their original condition upon completion?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 360:

Areas disturbed by the installation of temporary roadways shall be restored to their original condition or as directed by the Engineer. A note will be added to the plans in a future addendum to clarify this issue.

Question 359:

Will payment for excavation necessary for the removal of temporary paving be made under Item #202000?

Response to Question 359:

Additional excavation required for the removal of temporary pavement will be paid for under Item 202000.

Question 358:

This project is to be built in many phases which require the structure work to be phased as well. This phasing may require the use of temporary stage sheeting/SOE in order to accommodate the new construction and the traffic sequencing. If stage sheeting/SOE is required, how will the contractor be compensated for this as there does not appear to be any bid items for this potential work.

Response to Question 358:

A note was added in Addendum 4. For any structure excavation and MSE wall construction, the contractor may elect to use sheeting in a 202000 area and the cost should be incidental to the 202000 item.

Question 357:

Sheet 452 Note No. 3 talks about pile casings, are these the sleeves mentioned on the other structure drawings or something else? What is the size of the casing or sleeve?

Response to Question 357:

This was addressed in Addendum 2 Sheet 453. The callout is shown in the abutment section.

Question 356:

Sheet 461 of the plans does not state if the piling is sleeved.

Response to Question 356:

This was addressed in Addendum 2, see sheet 453 for pile casing.

Question 355:

Sheet 504 Note 1 says girder lines will not be erected until the previous one is. It appears, that the intent is to erect one girder from abutment A to abutment B before starting the next line. This puts the erector in a serious situation with an unsupported beam. Please check and see if the note should not have read each span shall be erected before the next one instead of next line. Note also refers you back to sheet 470 for more details but there are none relating to the erection on that page.

Response to Question 355:

Note 1 in Erection Stage 5 applies to Stage 5 only. The intent of completing a line of girders in Stage 5 is to stabilize the cross girder and prevent excessive rotation due to unbalanced loads.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Stages 1 thru 4 are to be erected span-by-span as shown on sheet 504. Additional notes will be included in Addendum 4 for clarity.

Question 354:

In areas where the pavement gets broken up and recompacted (for example as shown on typical sections on plan sheet 26) how is that operation paid for?

Response to Question 354:

This work shall be performed in accordance section 202.05 of the standard specifications and shall be paid for under item 202000.

Question 353:

Reference Adjust Overhead Sign Structure on plan sheet 78 says see detail on sheet XX. Where is that sheet found?

Response to Question 353:

The plans are updated in Addendum 3 to show this sign as being removed and the note was removed.

Question 352:

What is the current cut off date to submit questions?

Response to Question 352:

The cut-off date for questions was noon Thursday February 24, 2011. Each addendum issued will include the cut-off date for questions pertaining to that addendum. Direct follow-up questions to Department responses will be accepted for up to two calendar weeks after the Department's response is posted, or until one week prior to the bid date, whichever occurs first.

Question 351:

What is the anticipated release date of the addendum to address answers to a lot of the questions?

Response to Question 351:

Addendum 2 was issued February 24, 2011. Addendum 3 is being prepared for release.

Question 350:

Will the bid date be extended in order to provide Addendum #2, answers to questions, notifications of MOT phasing options, and allow time for contractors to meet with DelDOT for discussions?

Response to Question 350:

The bid date has been extended. The Department will not meet with contractors for discussion.

Question 349:

With regard to payment on the sign structures, how is the concrete for the caisson to be paid? Take, for example, sign structure C-2. It appears that the concrete qty for the C-2 Concrete Foundation, Class A breakout item includes both the wing wall portion of the foundation AND the caisson portion of the foundation. Is the concrete placement of the caisson included under this breakout item, or is it DELDOT's

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

intention for the caisson concrete to be paid under the C-2 5ft Dia. Concrete Caisson, Class A breakout item? Please clarify.

Response to Question 349:

The concrete for the sign structure foundation, linear feet of sign structure and the length of the caisson will not be measured. The sign structures will be paid for as a lump sum item under item 605523 and 605500. The concrete in the breakout sheet includes all of the concrete required to construct the foundation.

Question 348:

With regard to the limits of the caissons to the OH sign structures, from looking at both the concrete quantities and rebar lengths specified in the plans, it appears as though some of the caissons will extend up into the various footing types @ different lengths. Because of this, please confirm that the LF quantities shown in breakout sheets for the concrete caissons does not reflect the actual drilling quantities of the caissons themselves.

Response to Question 348:

The linear foot quantity only includes the distance from the bottom of the foundation to the tip of the caisson. The quantity is not related to the drilling length. The sign structures will be paid for under a lump sum item and not individual items.

Question 347:

Note #1 on drawing S6-18 conflicts with Note #3 on drawing S6-5 with respect to pile casings. The note on S6-18 states in part that "PILES SHALL NOT BE COATED OR CASED" whereas the note on S6-5 states that "PILE CASINGS SHALL BE INSTALLED AT THE PROPOSED PILE LOCATIONS DURING THE ABUTMENT MSE WALL CONSTRUCTION". Please clarify this ambiguity.

Response to Question 347:

These comments/questions are addressed in Addendum 3.

Question 346:

On Sheets #486 & #488 of 803 - Please verify the " F " dimensions for the sole plates ?

Response to Question 346:

The Sole Plate dimensions of the following sheets will need to be revised.

Sheet 486 – Guided Exp Bearing	F	G	H
Abutment A	1 1/4"	1 7/16"	1 5/8"
Abutment B	7/8"	1 1/4"	1 5/8"
Pier 1	1 1/2"	1 9/16"	1 5/8"
Pier 3	7/8"	1 1/4"	1 5/8"
Sheet 487 – Non Guided Exp Bearing			
Abutment A	1 5/16"	1 1/2"	1 5/8"
Abutment B	15/16"	1 1/4"	1 5/8"
Sheet 488 - Fixed Bearing			
Pier 2N&S	3"	2"	1"

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 345:

Paragraph #4 under the “CRITICAL DBE REQUIREMENTS” found on page 11 of the Proposal states the following:

“Failure of the apparent low bidder to present originals of all DBE subcontracts to substantiate the volume of work to be performed by DBE's as indicated in the bid within ten (10) calendar days after the bid opening shall create a rebuttable presumption that the bid is not responsive.”

The Templates for ALL Subcontract and/or Material Contract Agreements are project specific, take time to prepare properly, and are not usually generated until AFTER the contractor is aware that it is the apparent low bidder. On a project of this magnitude, it will take that much more time to properly generate agreements that are fair and equitable to both parties. In addition, the execution of a Subcontract or Material Contract Agreement usually requires negotiations between the parties which can sometimes require an extended period of time. Ten (10) calendar days to perform all of the above is somewhat unreasonable especially in the instance where a DBE Vendor may not act in good faith.

As such we request that this requirement be relaxed to provide the contractor a more reasonable time period (e.g.: 30 calendar days after the bid opening) to accomplish this task as we will undoubtedly require a number of DBE Vendors to attain the goal of 10% on this sizable project.

Response to Question 345:

The ten (10) calendar day requirement will not change. The apparent low bidder may request an extension from the Department’s DBE office if they have an issue with finalizing a DBE sub contract.

Question 344:

I strongly feel the earliest bid date should be no sooner than March 17th

Response to Question 344:

The bid date has been extended.

Question 343:

The responses to Questions #3 and #5 found on page 50 of 51 of the February 14, 2011 Q&A suggest that Addendum #2 has been published. A review of the DelDot website for this project indicates that only Addendum #1 has been issued and posted. Please advise if Addendum #2 has been issued and if so where has it been posted?

Response to Question 343:

Addendum 2 was issued on February 24, sent to all plan holders, and posted on the Website.

Question 342:

The current Questions and Answers dated February 14, 2011 that were just posted on DelDot’s website contain 245 questions. There are approximately 98 questions with no answers (“response forthcoming...”), approximately 36 more stating that the answers will be provided in an addendum, and yet another 45 or so questions where clarifications have been provided but the answers state that an addendum is needed to update the answer. A number of these answers will require either specification modifications and/or revised drawings to be issued. Not including the last category there are currently approximately 134 unanswered or unresolved questions and probably many more pending.

With only 15 calendar days left until the current bid deadline (today is 2/16/11) it appears that there may be insufficient time for the contractors to receive this information and then properly & intelligently evaluate, incorporate, and/or disseminate said information prior to 3/3/11. Considering that there are

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

probably many more questions in progress we respectfully request a minimum of at least a 1 week's time extension of the bid date to no earlier than March 10, 2011 or even to March 17, 2011. Please advise if this request will be considered.

Response to Question 342:

The bid date has been extended.

Question 341:

Page 32 of the Proposal (SPECIAL BIDDING PROCEDURE) requires that the contractor fill in the "Total number of calendar days (including Weather Days)" to comply with the "A" + "B" Special Bidding Procedure. The response to Q&A #228 states in part that "Both weather days and lost days must be on the critical path of the job at the time they occur to be counted".

Does the Table 1 on page 340 of the specifications account for "Lost Days" as well as "Weather Days" or is there some other way that the "Lost Days" are to be incorporated into the "Total number of days.." to be filled in on page 32 of the proposal?

Response to Question 341:

Table 1 on page 340 accounts for both 'Lost Days' and 'Weather Days' for purposes of completing page 32 of the Special Bidding Procedure.

Question 340:

Project note #7 states that all existing drainage structures and pipes within the project limits will be cleaned and this cost will be included in item 250000 – Sediment Removal. Bid Item #'s 612535, 612536, & 612537 are all for cleaning existing pipes within the project limits. And the quantity for Bid Item # 612529 Pipe Video Inspection is equal to the quantity of existing pipe to clean with no new pipe included.

Response to Question 340:

Project note 7 will be revised in Addendum 4 and will delete the reference to item 250000 and will add reference to items 612535, 612536 & 612537. The quantity for Pipe Video was revised in Addendum 2.

Question 339:

Please confirm that the thickness of the Pier 2 footings at Bridge S6 is to be 6'-0" as shown on Drawing S6-17 and as dimensioned on S6-21, but not 7.00 feet as determined by the elevations shown on Drawings S6-21 and S6-22. In addition, please provide the correct bottom of footing elevations for Pier 2.

Response to Question 339:

S6-21 elevations were clarified in Addendum #2; the bottom of footing elevations were adjusted to be consistent with the proposed pile cap dimensions on S6-17 of 6 feet.

Question 338:

Does all undercut encountered during excavation/embankment get paid for in Item "212000 Undercut Excavation"?

Response to Question 338:

The undercut excavation is to correct unstable subgrades and embankment foundations and paid under section 212. Undercut excavation for structures is included under section 207.07.

Undercut excavation for pipe trenches will be paid per section 208.06.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 337:

On page 311 of the proposal under the Field Office, Special special provision; paragraph 3 indicates various furnishings for the Field Office; is this listing for the entire field office complex or for each 1200 sf minimum field Office unit; please clarify.

Response to Question 337:

The furnishings listed in paragraph three are for the entire field office complex. Only one set of the listed furnishings are required for the entire project.

Question 336:

The EBS file printout's last page has lines for signature, agency and date. At the top of the page it states "I hereby certify that I have the authority to submit this bid." Do you want the signature of the person who signs the certification form or person delivering the bid? Is the agency the company submitting the bid? Is the date, the date of signature or date of delivering the bid?

Response to Question 336:

The signature should be a company officer or a person authorized by the company to enter into contractual agreements for the company. The agency is the company submitting the bid; the date should be the date of signature.

Question 335:

For Bid Item 759501 – Field Office , Special; the Special Provision on page 307 states that “the Contractor shall construct and maintain an all weather parking area adjacent to each field office of at least 6000 sf and having a minimum of 12 functional parking spaces striped for full size cars.” If each FIELD OFFICE UNIT of 1200 sf minimum is at the same location; please confirm that it is the intent to have 12000 sf minimum parking area (6000 sf x 2). There are several places throughout the Special Provision that state “FOR EACH FIELD OFFICE”; please confirm that the intent is for each field office unit of 1200 sf minimum. Also; on page 310 of the proposal under this Special Provision it states “the telephone system for the field offices shall have a total of 9 lines consisting of 8 direct single lines with call forward busy feature ----- . It appears by this statement that one phone system as described above is required for the field office complex (consisting of 2 field office units of 1200 sf min each). Please clarify if the above referenced phone is required for the field office complex or for each field office. In addition; on pages 311, 312 and 313 there are numerous items to furnish and outfit the field offices such as furniture, calculators, copier, digital camera, computer, software, network equipment etc; please clarify/confirm that it is the intent to supply what is listed on these pages for each field office of 1200 sf min; thus doubling what is shown for the entire field office complex. Please clarify/advise.

Response to Question 335:

We need only 12 spaces for the entire field office complex, not each individual unit. Same with the phones. 9 lines for the entire complex, not each individual unit. Same with all the furniture and furnishings. The amount required is intended to be sufficient for the entire complex, not each individual unit.

Question 334:

The Expedite bidding software requires that we enter an id number. This number is typically our Federal id number. What number should be input in the case of a Joint Venture bid?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 334:

Use the id number of the firm that received the bid disc. If both firms received a bid disc, you can use the id number of either firm.

Question 333:

Are we required to submit the copies of the American Traffic Safety Services Association Certification with our bid or within 10 days of notification of low bidder? Please confirm which level(s) of certification are required.

Response to Question 333:

ATSSA and DNREC (including Certified Site Reviewer) Certifications must be submitted by the apparent low bidder within ten (10) calendar days after the bid opening. Refer to the plan sheets for levels of certification required (plan sheet 4).

Question 332:

Are we required to submit the certification of each Certified Site Reviewer with our bid or within 10 days of notification of low bidder?

Response to Question 332:

ATSSA and DNREC (including Certified Site Reviewer) Certifications must be submitted by the apparent low bidder within ten (10) calendar days after the bid opening.

Question 331:

There is a conflict in the definition of Highway Construction Projects between the Federal General Decision Number DE100013 appearing on page 32 of the Proposal, which says that “other major bridges” are excluded and the All Agency Memorandum No. 130 of the U.S. Department of Labor Wage and Hour Division Guidelines, appearing on Proposal page 34 which lists “Highway bridges (overpasses, underpasses, grade separation)” as examples of Highway Construction. As mentioned in the Transcript of the Pre-Bid Meeting by Mr. Gottfried, and as stated in the last paragraph on page 30 of the Proposal “the employer’s minimum wage obligations are determined by whichever standards are higher.”

Response to Question 331:

The Department does not see a conflict. There are no “other major bridges” in this project (refer to question 328 response). The transcript and references to wage obligations you ask about are referring to differences between the state and federal prevailing wages.

Question 330:

In addition to the differences between the Federal Heavy wage rates and both the State and Federal Highway wage rates, there is the difference of Paid Holidays for Piledrivers and Operating Engineers. Please provide clarification to the above discrepancies.

Response to Question 330:

There are no Federal Heavy wage rates on this project. There is no conflict between the state and federal wage rates listed.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 329:

In the last paragraph under PREVAILING WAGES on page 30 of the Proposal (copy attached to this e-mail) it states that "In the event that a contract is not executed within one hundred twenty (120) days from the date the specifications were published, the rates in effect at the time of the execution of the contract shall be the applicable rates for the project." The creation date of the proposal document that we received is December 16, 2010. 120 days from that date would be April 15, 2011.

1. In light of the fact that we are still waiting for answers to a number of questions and receipt of Addendum #2, is there sufficient time to execute a contract before April 15, 2011?
2. Please provide us with the date that the specifications were published.

Response to Question 329:

This project and specifications were published December 6, 2010. It is likely new state wage rates will be effective prior to the execution of the contract for this project. Delaware issues new wage rates around March 15 of each year. The Department will be monitoring this and will advise if new wage rates will be effective for this contract.

Question 328:

In the pre-bid meeting transcript, Mr. Gottfried states on page 18 that "...this is a Delaware highway wage rate project" which "...has a dual wage rate for the feds and for the State of Delaware." The transcript continues to say that "...you have to use the more constrictive of the two, whichever one was the highest between the Davis Bacon and State of Delaware wage rate for highway construction. It just so happens this year the two are identical in every category. The prices are the same".

DelDOT has included State of Delaware and Federal Davis-Bacon prevailing wage rates in the Proposal for HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION. In both documents, a HIGHWAY Construction Project is defined as excluding "... bascule, suspension and spandrel arch bridges designed for commercial navigation, bridges involving marine construction; and other major bridges".

A review of the on-line Federal Davis-Bacon prevailing wage rates for HEAVY CONSTRUCTION shows that these are considerably higher (in most cases) than the HIGHWAY Construction rates referenced above and below.

As there ARE major bridges on this project, which set of wage rates will be held to?

Response to Question 328:

According to the federal Department of Labor Wage and Hour Division, Bridges classified as heavy bridges are bridges over navigable water (for commercial purposes). All other bridges are highway bridges. The wage rates included in the project are correct.

Question 327:

Drawing S1-58, note 1, they list the girder reaction as 554k. Is that for each girder, or total for all 6 girders?

Response to Question 327:

The maximum girder reaction specified in the notes is for "each" girder.

Question 326:

Under what item is removal of temporary paving including asphalt and stone base to be paid for?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 326:

Removal of Temporary paving is paid for under item 202000 Excavation and Embankment and shall be in accordance with Section 200 of the Standard Specifications.

Question 325:

At locations where the roadway adjacent to the top of a retaining wall is concrete, the sections indicate that the concrete paving is to overhang the top of the wall. There is no detail indicating that we may place the roadway to within a certain distance of the wall and make a separate pour for the overhang portion. Clearly we cannot place this entire section, with overhang, using conventional concrete paving methods. Please provide a detail for a separate pour similar to the moment slab used at asphalt locations and the joint that should be used to adjoin to the concrete paving. Additionally please consider use of a precast or slip formed moment slab at these locations.

Response to Question 325:

The concrete paving should be constructed in accordance with the standard details for PCC pavement. The joints shall also be in accordance with the standard details. It is up to the contractor to determine the means and methods to construct this work. See Project Note 33 regarding the use of pre-cast elements for this project.

Question 324:

May existing concrete and asphalt removed from roadways, bridges and barriers under this contract be placed in fills on the project as per section 202.05 of the standard specifications?

Response to Question 324:

Yes, existing concrete and asphalt may be placed in fills in accordance with Standard Spec. 202.

Question 323:

Bid Item #211000 requires, among other things, the removal of several overhead sign structures. Section 211 of the Standard Specification says in part that "This work consists of removal, wholly or in part, and satisfactory disposal of all buildings, foundations, fences, structures, and other obstructions which are not designated or permitted to remain within the right-of-way."

As it relates to the existing sign foundations for the overhead sign structures to be removed, are they required to be removed either "wholly or in part" if they do not interfere with the new construction? If the answer is yes, are they to be completely removed? Is there any information on the type and sizes of the existing foundations?

Response to Question 323:

Section 211 of the Standard Specifications, Construction methods states "Portions of structures outside of the stream shall be removed down 12" below natural ground surface." Sheet 4, note 4 was updated in Addendum 3 to add "Items removed under 211000 shall be removed to the limits described in standard specification 211000 or to a depth of 3' below grade, whichever is greater.

Question 322:

Contract Specification Page 188 indicates casing pipes are to be steel. Sheet 707 of the Contract Drawings indicate the casing pipe for the gas line is to be ductile iron (DI). For bidding purposes, assumption is made the drawing is in error, and the casing is to be constructed of steel. Do you concur? Please keep in mind the installation of the casing around the existing casing will require the use of a split casing whose

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

two halves will be welded together around the existing pipe. The welding of ductile iron pipe is impractical.

Response to Question 322:

The casing pipe will be installed by the utility owner. The plans will be updated in addendum 4.

Question 321:

For bidding purposes, assumption is made that the steel casing to be installed around the existing water line as shown on Sheet 707 of the Contract Drawings can be installed using a split steel casing whose two halves can be mated together by welding operations. Do you concur? Please note this will eliminate the need to replace any of the existing water.

Response to Question 321:

The casing pipe will be installed by the utility owner. The plans will be updated in addendum 4.

Question 320:

Of general note regarding Questions 319 and 320, assumption is made it is not the intent of Del DOT to have the Contractor remove and replace any of the existing water and gas lines shown on Sheet 707 which would require taking lines out of service or providing temporary by-pass line systems of prohibitive costs.

Response to Question 320:

DelDOT has no objection to the assumption.

Question 319:

Plan sheet 625 notes that "conversion of the facility to a permanent stormwater management facility shall be paid under item 271002 (stormwater management pond). This item is not listed in the schedule of prices. Under what item will this work be paid?"

Response to Question 319:

The notes on sheets 624 & 625 will be updated to state that this work will be paid for under Item 271000 and Item 271000 will be added to the schedule of prices in a future addendum.

Question 318:

The SSC (Sign, Stripe, & Conduit) Plans include sheets #726, #727, & #728 but there do not appear to be corresponding CP (Construction) Plans. Please advise.

Response to Question 318:

Sheets 726, 727 and 728 are for the construction of OH signs. Other than the improvements shown on these sheets there are no other improvements planned in these areas and construction plans were not developed for these areas.

Question 317:

Please refer to dimensions of the abutments shown on Drawing Sheet Nos. S6-6, S6-8, S6-9 and S6-11. The 4'-0", 1'-9" and 1'-8" dimensions shown in Section B-B on S6-8 and S6-11 do not match those shown on S6-6 and S6-9. Also, The 3'-8", 1'-9" and 1'-8" dimensions shown in Section C-C on S6-8 and S6-11 do not match those shown on S6-6 and S6-9. Lastly, The 3'-9" and 1'-9" dimensions shown in Section D-D on S6-8 and S6-11 do not match those shown on S6-6 and S6-9. Please clarify.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 317:

Sheets S6-6 & S6-9 are correct, starting from the front face of the abutment cap, the dimensions are, 2'-0", 1'-6", 1'-4", 1'-0".

Sheet S6-8 & S6-11, Section B-B and C-C will be clarified in a future addendum. The Section B-B dimensions should read, from front face of MSE wall, 2'-0" & 1'-6" The overall dimension from the centerline of bearing to the back of the approach slab notch should be 3'-8". The Section C-C dimensions should read, from front face of MSE wall, 2'-0" & 1'-6" The overall dimension from the centerline of bearing to the backwall should be 3'-6".

Question 316:

Bridges S1 thru S5 indicate 30" diameter corrugated metal casings with No. 57 stone between pile and casing on the typical abutment sections. Bridge S6 – Drawing S6-5, Note 3 requires installation of pile casings at proposed pile locations during abutment MSE Wall construction. Drawing S6-18, Note 1 states that piles will not be coated or cased. Please clarify casing requirements, if any, at Bridge S6.

Response to Question 316:

The abutment piles are to be cased. No coating is required. The pile notes have been clarified in a prior Addendum.

Question 315:

Please refer to drawings S6-31 and S6-32 regarding the HPS-70W Steel. Please verify that only the top and bottom flanges for G2 thru G4 are to be the HPS-70W Steel and not G1.

Response to Question 315:

G1 top and bottom flanges are also HPS70W. The notation of (HPS70W) refers to all 4 girder lines not just G2, G3 & G4.

Question 314:

Will the Contractor be permitted to utilize a construction joint in the Bridges S6 pier stems where the upper portion flare begins, similar to what is allowed on Bridge S1 and S4??

Response to Question 314:

Yes an optional construction joint is allowed at the flare transition.

Question 313:

Per 2001 Standard Specifications, Section 619.14 indicates ten production pile restrikes incidental to the price bid for the selected pile type. Special Provision 619501 requires the first ten restrikes on selected production piles shall be performed at no cost to the Department. In addition; Structure S6 Drawing 18, Note 8D indicates the first 12 production pile restrikes for this Mall Bridge shall be performed at no cost to the Department. Please clarify payment for Production Pile restrikes: 1. First 10 for Project @ No Cost?? 2. First 10 for each pile type @ No Cost?? 3. First 12 @ Mall Bridge at No Cost. Please clarify

Response to Question 313:

The pile notes have been clarified in a prior Addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 312:

There appears to be large stockpiles of material in both the Northwest and Southwest loop ramps at the I-95/SR-1/Rte 7 interchange area. It does not look like this material is being utilized as embankment (borrow) for this project. Are these stockpiles of material available for use as embankment on the project??? Are they suitable for embankment on this project?? Please advise.

Response to Question 312:

If material meets the requirements for F Borrow, the material can be used for Embankment. It is the contractor's responsibility to maintain the current drainage patterns during and at the conclusion of all excavations.

Question 311:

Will the mass excavation to subgrade for MSE walls (as shown on the Ramp A cross sections at Station 1246+00) be paid for under item #202000?

Response to Question 311:

All excavation required for the construction of the MSE Wall will not be measured and will be incidental to the construction of the pertinent Retaining Wall or Abutment Items, as stated in the method of measurement section of 602772-MSE Walls

Question 310:

There are no specifications for item 743005, Furnish / Maintain Portable Light Assembly. Is this for use as temporary substitution of existing lighting systems or for the contractor's light plants needed for any night time operations?

Response to Question 310:

743005 is a standard specification, which are not typically included with the special provisions. This item is intended for use during night time work.

Question 309:

On Breakout Sheet #7, Items #51, #54, & #57 each call for "4ft Dia. Concrete Caissons" for Overhead Sign Structures #18, #19, & #20 while the details (Section A-A) on drawings #738F & 738G show the caissons to be 5'-0" diameter. Please advise which is correct.

Response to Question 309:

The drawings are correct. The breakout sheet will be updated in a future addendum.

Question 308:

Please clarify the type of concrete that is required for Bid Item #605523. The breakout sheet states class A, the special provisions #749516 & 749519 state Class B, and the plan sheets 737 & 738F of 803 state either Class A, B, C, or E.

Response to Question 308:

The class of concrete for bid item 605523 shall be class A per the Breakout Sheet and the Special Provision. Special Provisions 749516 and 749519 are not used for sign structures and plan sheets 737 and 738F detail the type of footing and not the class of concrete.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 307:

Sheet 198 note 6 says ten feet of the beams shall be painted at each end but the special provision says the entire beam gets coated. What is the scope of the painting?

Response to Question 307:

Paint shall be applied per plan note 6. The scope of painting is not described in the special provisions 605537, 605002 and 605575 or Section 605 of the Standard Specifications.

Question 306:

Sheet 211, 212, 213 & 368 have varying radius on each side of the columns. Can the radius be changed to a common value such as 30'-0" to prevent the need for custom forming the top of four columns? That would be eight separate forms when two would do.

Response to Question 306:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed pier as depicted in the contract documents.

Question 305:

Sheet 198 note 1 states that the back up plate must be cut and fabricated from the piling. Can a commercially provided splice like a weld fit splicer be used? This goes for all bridges.

Response to Question 305:

Contractor shall provide the pile splice in accordance with the contract documents.

Question 304:

Sheet 199 for the 12" header on typical abutment sections should there be a keyway between pours and if so what is the size of it? (All bridges)

Response to Question 304:

The required keyways between pours are indicated in the plans. The 12" header concrete is to facilitate the expansion dam installation. See sheet 247 for expansion dam details and a keyway is not required.

Question 303:

Sheet 200 No dimensions or elevations for cheek wall.

Response to Question 303:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 200, 202, 204, 205 & 206.

Question 302:

Sheet 208 has specific instructions for constructing the MSE wall. It states there will be a quarantine period of seven (7) days after completion of stage I. Then it states there will be quarantine periods after each 5ft lift. Is that quarantine period 7 days or is it another increment of time?

Response to Question 302:

Each 5-foot lift above the stage 1 max fill height requires an additional 7-day quarantine period.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 301:

Sheet 211, 212, 213 & 368 have varying radius on each side of the columns. Can the radius be changed to a common value such as 30'-0" to prevent the need for custom forming the top of four columns? That would be eight separate forms when two would do.

Response to Question 301:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed pier as depicted in the contract documents.

Question 300:

Sheet 214 no detail for the shear studs and post tensioning holes for G3 and G4.

Response to Question 300:

Details for G3 and G4 are included in the detail SHEAR STUDS (GIRDERS 2 – 5), which means 2 thru 5.

Question 299:

Sheet 218 no detail for the shear studs and post tensioning holes for G3 and G4.

Response to Question 299:

Details for G3 and G4 are included in the detail SHEAR STUDS (GIRDERS 2 – 5), which means 2 thru 5.

Question 298:

Sheet 218 Pier No.2 is fixed, there is no indication of the beams are to be welded to the masonry plates to fix them. We believe in order to have the steel function the beams need to be fixed at P2.

Response to Question 298:

The design does not require the girders to be welded to the masonry plate. If the contractor proposes to weld the bottom flange of the girder to the steel masonry plate for erection purposes, the details will need to be provided in the contractors proposed erection plan.

Question 297:

Sheet 222 no detail for the shear studs and post tensioning holes for G3 and G4.

Response to Question 297:

Details for G3 and G4 are included in the detail SHEAR STUDS (GIRDERS 2 – 5), which means 2 thru 5.

Question 296:

Sheet 234 can the cross frames be welded?

Response to Question 296:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed cross frames as depicted in the contract documents

Question 295:

Sheet 235 drip bar on both sides of piers?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 295:

Up elevation side only.

Question 294:

Sheet 252 has the footer been designed to take the loads of the shoring?

Response to Question 294:

The footings are designed to withstand the loads indicated on the plans. It is the responsibility of the contractor to verify that the proposed shoring system and erection scheme will not cause an overstress condition. The shoring system depicted in the plans is schematic, the actual shoring system and erection scheme are to be designed by the contractor.

Question 293:

Sheet 252 supporting the beams solely on jacks is not advisable or safe in our opinion. Are beams strong enough to support the weight if the supports are adjacent to the jacks?

Response to Question 293:

Please clarify the second sentence. In addition, the details provided are only schematics, the temporary shoring is to be designed and detailed by the contractor.

Question 292:

Sheet 259 no dimensions or elevations for cheek walls.

Response to Question 292:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 259, 261, 263, 264 & 265..

Question 291:

Sheet 271 Elevation has a dimension of 6'-5" Tangent. Tangent to what?

Response to Question 291:

It means that portion of the tendon which is linear, straight, or tangent and not parabolic.

Question 290:

Sheet 271 states the strands are parabolic. What is the information for the parabola?

Response to Question 290:

We will provide additional information in the next addendum so the parabola can be calculated.

Question 289:

Sheet 273 is the A and G dimension of 2ft adequate for development length?

Response to Question 289:

If you are referring to the #11 bars in the pier cap, yes. The 2'-0" A and G dimension is the standard leg dimension of a 90 degree hook.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 288:

Sheet 279, 282 is the A and G dimension of 2ft adequate for development length?

Response to Question 288:

If you are referring to the #11 bars in the pier cap, yes. The 2'-0" A and G dimension is the standard leg dimension of a 90 degree hook.

Question 287:

Sheet 289 no details for underpass lighting conduit to feed UP14

Response to Question 287:

Underpass lighting conduits shall be installed in accordance with 745549 Installation of Bridge-Mounted Conduit From Work Area Above Bridge Deck.

Question 286:

Sheet 290 can cross frames be welded?

Response to Question 286:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed cross frames as depicted in the contract documents.

Question 285:

Sheet 291 drip bars on both sides of pier?

Response to Question 285:

Up elevation side only.

Question 284:

Sheet 312 no elevation for cheek walls.

Response to Question 284:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 312, 314, 316, 317 & 318.

Question 283:

Sheet 323 there is a dimension that says it is tangent, tangent to what?

Response to Question 283:

It means that portion of the tendon which is linear, straight, or tangent and not parabolic.

Question 282:

Sheet 333 no details for underpass lighting conduit to feed UP12 and UP13

Response to Question 282:

Underpass lighting conduits shall be installed in accordance with 745549 Installation of Bridge-Mounted Conduit From Work Area Above Bridge Deck.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 281:

Sheet 334 can cross frames be welded?

Response to Question 281:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed cross frames as depicted in the contract documents.

Question 280:

Sheet 354 no elevation for top of cheek walls.

Response to Question 280:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 354, 356, 358, 359 & 360.

Question 279:

Sheet 371 Pier is fixed, there is no indication of the beams are to be welded to the masonry plates to fix them. We believe in order to have the steel function the beams need to be fixed at P2. Beams 2 & 3 should be welded to the masonry plates.

Response to Question 279:

The design does not require the girders to be welded to the masonry plate. If the contractor proposes to weld the bottom flange of the girder to the steel masonry plate for erection purposes, the details will need to be provided in the contractors proposed erection plan.

Question 278:

Sheet 377 no details for underpass lighting conduit to feed UP11 and UP16

Response to Question 278:

Underpass lighting conduits shall be installed in accordance with 745549 Installation of Bridge-Mounted Conduit From Work Area Above Bridge Deck.

Question 277:

Sheet 378 can cross frames be welded?

Response to Question 277:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed cross frames as depicted in the contract documents

Question 276:

Sheet 379 drip bars on both sides of piers?

Response to Question 276:

Up elevation side only.

Question 275:

Sheet 393 are the footers designed to take the load of the shoring?

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 275:

The footings are designed to withstand the loads indicated on the plans. It is the responsibility of the contractor to verify that the proposed shoring system and erection scheme will not cause an overstress condition. The shoring system depicted in the plans is schematic, the actual shoring system and erection scheme are to be designed by the contractor.

Question 274:

Sheet 394 Bridge S5 shows that the tube piles have concrete 18'-3" deep. However the ground elevation is 29.95' below abutment A and 19.65 below abutment B. After the piles are driven you will have a gap between the 18'-3" and the ground. How do you want this filled? This condition exists at the other abutments through the project.

Response to Question 274:

The length of the concrete in the top of the pipe piles was determined based upon the bond between the concrete and the steel pile, so as to effectively transfer the loads from the pile to the pile cap. The gap between this concrete fill and the ground line does not need to be filled.

Question 273:

Sheet 399 no dimensions or elevations for cheek walls

Response to Question 273:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 399, 401, 403, 404 & 405.

Question 272:

Sheet 408 has specific instructions for constructing the MSE wall. It states there will be a quarantine period of seven (7) days after completion of stage I. Then it states there will be quarantine periods after each 5ft lift. Is that quarantine period 7 days or is it another increment of time?

Response to Question 272:

Each 5 foot lift above the stage 1 max fill height requires an additional 7-day quarantine.

Question 271:

Sheet 420 is the A&G lengths of 1'10" right? P1001E, P1002E, P1021E, P1022E

Response to Question 271:

Yes.

Question 270:

Sheet 421 is the A&G lengths of 1'10" right? P1041E, P1042E

Response to Question 270:

Yes.

Question 269:

Sheet 430 can cross frames be welded?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 269:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed cross frames as depicted in the contract documents

Question 268:

Sheet 431 drip bars both sides of piers?

Response to Question 268:

Up elevation side only.

Question 267:

Sheet 453 no dimensions or elevations for cheek walls.

Response to Question 267:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 453, 455, 457, 458 & 459.

Question 266:

Sheet 457 no dimensions or elevations for cheek walls.

Response to Question 266:

The information to construct the cheek walls are provided on sheets 453, 455, 457, 458 & 459.

Question 265:

Sheet 466 the concrete post tensioned cap is shown flush with the bottom of the lower flanges. The other bridges have this flush with the top of the lower flanges. Should be the same as the others.

Response to Question 265:

The concrete shall be flush with the top of the bottom flange. Will be addressed in future addendum.

Question 264:

Sheet 472 note 6 states that cover plate goes in after Parapets. Cover plate only covers the gap where there is not a deck?

Response to Question 264:

The cover plate can only cover the top of the cross girder outside of the bridge deck.

Question 263:

Sheet 476 the concrete post tensioned cap is shown flush with the bottom of the lower flanges. The other bridges have this flush with the top of the lower flanges. Should be the same as the others.

Response to Question 263:

The concrete shall be flush with the top of the bottom flange. Will be addressed in future addendum.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 262:

Sheet 478 chart with lengths S1, S2, S3, S4, L1, L2, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, L8, L9, L10, L12 and L13 is missing.

Response to Question 262:

Will be addressed in future addendum.

Question 261:

Sheet 478 no details for underpass lighting conduit to feed UP10 and UP15

Response to Question 261:

Underpass lighting conduits shall be installed in accordance with 745549 Installation of Bridge-Mounted Conduit From Work Area Above Bridge Deck.

Question 260:

Sheet 483 can cross frames be welded instead of bolted?

Response to Question 260:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed cross frames as depicted in the contract documents.

Question 259:

Sheet 483 Drip Bar on both sides of pier?

Response to Question 259:

Up elevation side only.

Question 258:

Sheet 493, 494 no dimension for deck edge thickness. The plans show the bottom level. This will result in a very thick deck on the left overhang which will affect the form work and possibly the deflection of the beams. Can you give a deck edge thickness such as 10" like the rest of the bridges?

Response to Question 258:

Plans will be modified in a future addendum.

Question 257:

Sheet 503 is the footer designed to take the shoring?

Response to Question 257:

The footings are designed to withstand the loads indicated on the plans. It is the responsibility of the contractor to verify that the proposed shoring system and erection scheme will not cause an overstress condition. The shoring system depicted in the plans is schematic, the actual shoring system and erection scheme are to be designed by the contractor.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 256:

Sheet 523 refers to girder notch in plan view but paving notch in elevation.

Response to Question 256:

Plans will be revised to reflect consistent description.

Question 255:

Sheet 523 the elevation shows a girder/paving notch. But no dimensions for the concrete under the notch. It is not clear what the intent of this notch is. Please clarify.

Response to Question 255:

Please clarify the question. The end of the box beam is solid concrete as shown on sheet 523.

Question 254:

Sheet 524 this and other sheets show conduit in the parapet. However there is no dimension or other references to parapet in the conduit. Is it the intent to have it in the parapet and if so how many, what size and so on.

Response to Question 254:

This will be addressed in a future addendum

Question 253:

Sheet 524 has it been verified that there are existing threaded inserts in the fascia box girder?

Response to Question 253:

The as-built plans indicate the threaded inserts are located in the exterior face of the fascia girder.

Question 252:

Sheet 528 is it the intent of the designer to have the strip seal replaced over the width the bridge after construction is completed? Or just put new strip seal in the new extrusions?

Response to Question 252:

Yes the intent is to replace the entire strip. The plans will be modified to reflect.

Question 251:

Sheet 529 refers to conduit expansion joints but there are no conduit details.

Response to Question 251:

This will be addressed in a future addendum

Question 250:

Sheet 531 shows conduit but no size or details.

Response to Question 250:

This will be addressed in a future addendum

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 249:

The notes in the contract drawings for the MSE Walls state on most walls that undercutting may be required. Bid Item #212000 has a quantity of 2,500 CY of Undercutting. Per Section 212.08 of the 2001 Standard Specifications, "The material used for backfilling undercut areas will be paid under applicable Sections". Please advise if Bid Item #210000, Type 'C' Borrow' is the item that will be used to backfill any MSE undercut areas. If so, how much of the 5,722 CY Plan Quantity has been allocated for this Undercutting? If not, please advise which Bid Item will be used and what quantity has been set aside for this work.

Response to Question 249:

Special Provision 602772 will be updated in an addendum to clarify that undercut in these areas will be paid for under Item 212000. The Special Provision will also be updated to remove the requirement for backfilling the undercut areas with No 57 stone underlain with filter fabric, and will require these areas to be backfilled with Type B Borrow.

Question 248:

Will Precast (P/C) Barriers be permitted to be utilized on the MSE Walls at the Moment Slab locations or at the PCC Pavement Section locations or at both? Other states such as Pennsylvania and New Jersey do permit the use of P/C Barriers on MSE Walls in certain cases.

Response to Question 248:

See Sheet 5, Project Note 33 which outlines items precast structural elements that will not be allowed .

Question 247:

Note #13 under General Notes on drawing S1-2 (#196) is entitled "Deck Replacement" and reads as follows: "Future deck replacement for this bridge must take into account the unbalanced moment from the superstructure on the bearings at Piers 1 and 3. It is recommended that the deck be replaced in a symmetrical fashion, working in the regions at both fascia girders at the same time, and progressing in stages toward the center of the typical section. This approach will eliminate the possibility of uplift at the bearings for Piers 1 and 3." Bridge S1 is the only structure that contains this note.

As this is a brand new structure, how is this note relevant at this structure under this contract? Are we required to provide any type of uplift restraint(s) under this contract for future deck replacements? If so, please provide the details and payment method.

Response to Question 247:

This note is for future deck replacement by others. Uplift restraints are not a requirement of this contract.

Question 246:

The Special Provision for Item 602772 - Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls on pages 92 and 93 of the proposal state the following: "The design of the internal stability of the MSE wall shall be the responsibility of the wall manufacturer. Design constraints imposed by external(overall) stability, such as allowable bearing pressure due to the combined effects of vertical and lateral loads, minimum length of reinforcing elements, as set forth herein, shall be the responsibility of the Contractor." Additionally it states "External Stability: The responsibility for global stability of a MSE Wall structure will rest with the Contractor. Global stability refers to the overall rotational stability involving both the reinforced soil

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

mass and native soil or rock. Sliding, overturning, and bearing capacity shall be evaluated by the wall supplier. The allowable bearing capacity at the MSE walls shall be determined by the Contractor and submitted for approval by the Engineer." In addition; there are references in the Geotechnical Report for the Retaining Walls that indicate that the external stability and global stability are the responsibility of the Contractor. As for the requirement that the wall supplier being responsible for internal stability of the MSE Walls; this is common practice and not an issue. The requirement for the Contractor being responsible for the external stability, global stability and bearing capacity; this is not common practice. These parameters are normally evaluated by the owners Engineer during the evaluation/design process as to whether MSE Walls are feasible for a project. It appears that extensive work has been done by the owners Engineers to evaluate all of the parameters referenced above to come up with details/requirements for the MSE Wall information that has been included in the contract documents; for example increasing reinforcing lengths (minimums) and the use of LWEF as backfill. In talking with the MSE Wall suppliers; it appears that they are not going to deal with the external stability, global stability and bearing capacity issues; leaving the Contractor the responsibility/risk for these requirements. These requirements/risks are not normally handled by the Contractor and will most likely require the Contractor to seek outside engineering services; this is a major issue prebid and appears to be duplicating efforts that have already been done and adding significant costs. The time, effort and cost to go through all the information provided especially prebid and do what is being ask is significant as well as the added risk placed on the Contractor. This seems to put the Contractor in the middle of something he has no control over. We respectfully request that DELDOT revise the External Stability, Global Stability and Bearing Capacity requirements to be the Owner's responsibility that is common industry practice.

Response to Question 246:

Special Provision for Item 602772 - Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls will be updated in an addendum, such that Global Stability is the responsibility of the owner.

February 14, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for new responses through February 14;
37, 38, 40-45, 48, 55, 62-71, 73-75, 99, 109, 122-129, 131, 132, 135, 137-144, 170-176, 189, 204-206

Questions 209 through 245 are new questions and responses.

Question 245:

On page 114 of the specifications, the duct size required for a 1-1/4" PT bar is not commonly available in 24 gage material and AASHTO requirements allow for use of 26 gage up to 2.625" dia. Please verify 26 gage is acceptable for duct diameters less than 2.625".

Response to Question 245:

The special provisions will be updated to allow 26 gauge material in an addendum.

Question 244:

On page 114 of the specifications, the last sentence of this section indicates HDPE can be used in lieu of galvanized metal duct. Please clarify that polypropylene, as defined in Section "Ducts (Strand Tendons)", may also be used.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 244:

The special provision will be updated in an addendum to allow the use of polypropylene, as defined in Section "Ducts (Strand Tendons)".

Question 243:

On page 114 of the specifications, please clarify how air-pressure testing is to be carried out if/when metal corrugated duct with interlocking seams is used. This duct will not hold pressure.

Response to Question 243:

The embedded ducts shall meet the air pressure test requirements listed under section (e) of the Grouting Operations.

Question 242:

First paragraph AFTER bullet points on pg 118, middle of paragraph – "...require additional tests for Tendon Modulus of Elasticity and/or In-Place Friction." Where in the Specs are these tests defined? If it's DelDOT's intention to have these procedures to be performed, they need to be specified.

Response to Question 242:

The special provision will be updated in an addendum to remove this statement.

Question 241:

For Bridge S8, with regard to concrete payment, where are the intermediate/end/continuity diaphragms to be paid under, Item 602013? Please clarify.

Response to Question 241:

Diaphragm concrete shall be paid under Item 602013. Note 3 of the General Notes will be modified to clarify this issue in an addendum.

Question 240:

The following item numbers are shown on the typical sections, but the bid item is not included with the bid tabs. Please advise as to how these items are to be paid.

Letter "J" - ITEM 602017 - PCC Masonry, Parapet, Class A: Typical Sections pages 22, 23, 26, 27, 32, 33, 40, 41

Letter "X" - ITEM 712005 - Riprap, R-4: Typical Sections pages 9, 19, 23- 27, 30 & 47

Letter "CC" - ITEM 755000 - Hot-Mix, Hot Laid, Bituminous Concrete Curb: Typical Sections pages 7 & 14.

Response to Question 240:

Item 602017 is shown on the bid tab. Line No. 3010, of the fixed quantity items.

Item 712005 and the associated quantity will be added by addendum.

Item 755000 is being removed from the typical sections by addendum.

Question 239:

With respect to Note #5 under General Notes on drawing S9-2, will shop painting be permitted for the final coat(s) for the new structural steel @ S9?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 239:

Shop painting for the final coat will be permitted and shall be performed in accordance with Standard Specification 605.37

Question 238:

Are electric conduits and junction boxes required in any of the bridge parapets and/or MSE/roadway barrier items? If so, what is spec & size? See detail on sheets S8-14 & S8-19 which is the only structure that indicates electrical conduits in a new structure but no size or material type is provided.

Response to Question 238:

The conduit runs on S8 are 2" (power) and 3" (comm). The drawings will be updated to reflect this clarification and material type in an addendum. Currently no other conduits are on the remaining bridge parapets or barriers.

Question 237:

On most of the SSC drawings (SSD-1 thru SSC-18) there is a note that states that "ALL EXISTING OVERHEAD AND BRIDGE MOUNTED SIGNS AND STRUCTURES SHALL BE REMOVED BY THE CONTRACTOR WITHIN THE CONTRACT LIMITS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED". This tells us that all signs and sign structures are to be removed within the contract limits U.O.N. In addition to the questions already posted, there are a number of existing signs and sign structures that are graphically shown and specifically called out to be removed and a number of signs and sign structures that are graphically shown and NO call out is present. Since DelDot does not provide "Tab Sheets" which tabulate all items of work by Bid Item, we request that some form of clarification be provided so that the contractor will be able to price up only those signs and sign structures that the Department desires the contractor to remove under this contract.

Response to Question 237:

The plans will be updated in an addendum to clarify which signs and sign structures are to be removed under this contract.

Question 236:

Note #1 under Pile Installation Notes on sheet #S6-18 states that "All piles shall be pipe piles (ASTM A 252), Grade 50. Piles shall not be coated or cased. As none of the other bridges makes these call outs, and the specifications do not require it otherwise, please confirm that none of the piles are to be coated.

Response to Question 236:

The note will be updated to be consistent with bridges S1-S5 in an addendum.

Question 235:

The notes in the contract drawings for the MSE Walls state on most walls that undercutting may be required. Since this is an "A+B" project and therefore our bid is based on time, will any and all time required for undercutting be treated as a changed condition since there is no way for us to evaluate this unknown during the bidding stage?

Response to Question 235:

As part of Addendum 3 we revised the MSE wall spec to state the excavation of unsuitable material will be paid for under Item 212000 undercut excavation. Additionally we revised the

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

required of the backfill material to Borrow B since this is the material that the contractor is directed to use under walls that are not on virgin soils (walls which have foundations in fill) The spec now states that the Borrow Type B will be paid for under Item 209002. Also since we are now using Borrow B to backfill we eliminated the need for filter fabric.

Question 234:

The notes in the contract drawings for the MSE Walls have varying mandated requirements (from 30 – 67+ calendar days) for Quarantine periods before certain follow-on work can commence. Since this is an “A+B” project and therefore our bid is based on time, which timeframe should use when preparing our bid schedule; the minimum, the maximum, or other?

Response to Question 234:

The plans will be updated to clarify the required quarantine periods.

Question 233:

Is the 30-60 Day Quarantine period at all Bridge Abutment MSE Walls prior to driving piles (e.g.: #4 @ S1-4) concurrent with or separate to 37-67 Day Quarantine at all Bridge Abutment MSE Walls after reaching maximum fill height prior to further construction (e.g.: S1-14 Foundation Notes)?

Response to Question 233:

Note #4 on S1-4 focuses on the 60 day quarantine period that is required "upon completion of the MSE wall" to it's full height. During construction of the MSE wall, there are limitations as to how much fill can be placed at a time, and the quarantine period that is required after each fill increment. This is detailed in the notes on S1-14. The 60 day quarantine period applies after completion of the MSE wall to it's full height.

Question 232:

The specifications and drawings require an architectural finish on all new MSE Walls on the project. In addition to the several questions that have been asked about a specification for this finish, is an Anti-Graffiti coating required on any of these walls as well? What about on any of the new bridge structures?

Response to Question 232:

Anit-Graffiti coating is not required on the walls or bridges.

Question 231:

The specifications for both LD's (Liquidated Damages) and RULD's (Road User Costs and Liquidated Damages) are generally clear on page 2 of the specifications as to when and how they will be assessed. However, there is always “Punchlist” work that is required when a project, especially of this magnitude, is nearing completion.

- (1) Assuming that no “Punchlist” work requires lane or shoulder width restrictions, will any or all remaining punchlist work be subject to the \$6,400/calendar day LD's?
- (2) If the contractor and the Department cannot agree on what is “Punchlist” work or if the punchlist work is satisfactorily completed, how will this be resolved?

Response to Question 231:

The Liquidated Damages will remain in effect until work requiring lane or shoulder closures is substantially completed. That definition, per the Standard Specifications states:

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Subsection 101.79 Substantial Completion. (3/18/2004)

The point at which all Contract items are complete as deemed by the Department excluding any warranties or vegetation growth.

All of the work items bid must be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineer to constitute Substantial Completion. Any added work to the Contract would be negotiated in advance for additional time and/or payments.

A punchlist will be generated well in advance of the substantial completion of the work. This punchlist will clearly indicate any items that need to be finished to constitute Substantial Completion and also any that are determined to be added work or repair items. The punchlist will result from an inspection attended by Owner and Contractor representatives. The inspection will be scheduled at a mutually agreeable date to allow time for completion of any required work items. Should the Contractor and DelDOT fail to reach agreement on the items necessary for Substantial Completion, then the Contractor should submit a claim in accordance with Section 105.15.

Question 230:

The specifications for Bid Items 763508 and 763509 in the last full paragraph on page 334 state that “The Contractor’s Original CPM schedule shall allocate the work over the entire Contract Time. The Contractor shall not anticipate early completion in bid preparation and shall distribute all time-driven and/or time-dependent costs uniformly over every day of the Contract Time when preparing the bid. No early completion schedules will be accepted”.

- (1) Since this is an “A+B” bid doesn’t this paragraph need to be either rewritten or deleted?
- (2) Is this CPM schedule required to be cost loaded?
- (3) If the answer to #2 is yes, will the cost loading of the schedule be used in any way for additions or deletions to the contract?

New Response to Question 230:

~~The specification paragraph will be adjusted by addendum to highlight that~~ “ The Contract Time is the number of days the contractor submits as his “ B” portion of the bid.

The schedule does not have to be cost loaded. The Contractor may elect to do so if he wishes, but it is not a contract requirement to do so. Answer # 2 is No, thus there is no response to Question #3.

Question 229-1:

Q&A #229 requested guidance on how Utility Delays would be treated if a Utility Company does not perform. The second paragraph of DelDot’s response stated that:

“Timeframes listed in the Utility statement must be included in the Contractor’s CPM schedule. A delay will only be considered if the Utility Company exceeds the timeframe so noted in the Utility Statement.”

1. Assuming that the contractor notified the proper parties in a timely manner and performed the work listed under the “State’s Contractor Responsibility” section timely and properly, will proper time extensions be granted if a Utility performs its work at a different point in time then what the contractor envisioned (e.g.: performs the work in August instead of June) even if said Utility completed its work in the allotted timeframe stated in the “Utility Statement”?
2. Can we assume that the calendar day durations given in the Utility Statement are consecutive durations and not spread out over time?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 229-1:

Please refer again to the responses to questions 229, 378 and the Standard Specifications. Note that the Utility Statement has been revised in Addendum 4.

Question 229:

The specifications for Bid Items 763508 and 763509 in the last full paragraph on page 333 require that utilities be included as CPM activities. Historically the Utility Companies do not always complete their work either in the time allotted or at the time that they are required to do so. Will these concerns be treated like any other changed condition when it comes to the need for additional contract time?

Response to Question 229:

Utility work in question must be on the critical path. Often, Utility work is beyond the control of both the Owner and the Contractor. If critical path work is delayed by Utilities failing to complete their work as outlined in the Utility Statement, then an extension of time may be granted as outlined under Section 105.21, however, the day is considered non-compensatory as far as the contractor recovering any costs related to the delay. He can recover the time, but no delay costs. Section 105.09, paragraph 5, also reiterates that no monetary compensation is allowed for failure of Utilities to complete in accordance with the durations given in the Utility Statement.

Timeframes listed in the Utility statement must be included in the Contractor's CPM schedule. A delay will only be considered if the Utility Company exceeds the timeframe so noted in the Utility Statement.

Question 228:

The specifications for Bid Items 763508 and 763509 on page 338 provide the definition for a "Lost day" which is similar to a "weather day" and appears to be intended to address critical path work that is affected after a bona fide weather event occurs. As "Lost days" are not provided for on page 32 of the proposal, how will these be used in the calculation of contract time?

Response to Question 228:

Lost days are days where work is not possible after a major weather event such as a rain/ice/snow storm. We may lose work days following the event due to the wet conditions. These lost days are counted as an additional weather day. Both weather days and lost days must be on the critical path of the job at the time they occur to be counted.

Question 227:

Per Bid Item 763508 and 763509, DelDot's definition of a "weather day" is when "Any Calendar Day (including weekends and Holidays) on which a weather event prohibits contract work on critical path activities. Events include, but are not limited to rain, snow, or extreme temperatures". (1) This should be amended to include declared states of emergencies.

Response to Question 227:

Section 105.21 and 108.07 list various reasons for which the Engineer may grant a time extension in addition to weather. Declared "States of Emergency" would be covered by these clauses, thus there is no need to amend.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 226:

If the contractor and DelDOT cannot agree on what constitutes a bona fide weather day, how will this be resolved?

Response to Question 226:

Contractor and DelDOT discuss the issue in the field and try to reach agreement. If agreement cannot be reached in the field, then the Contractor should follow the claim procedure outlined in Standard Spec Section 105.15 as he would for any other dispute.

Question 225:

If the contractor feels that work can be progressed and the Department disagrees, or vice versa, how will this be resolved?

Response to Question 225:

Contractor and DelDOT discuss the issue in the field and try to reach agreement. If agreement cannot be reached in the field, then the Contractor should follow the claim procedure outlined in Standard Spec Section 105.15 as he would for any other dispute.

Question 224:

Please confirm that DBE's must be selected from the Unified Directory of Certified DBE Firms, Federal Fiscal Year 2011 – 1st Quarter Publication found on DelDOT's website and no other listing.

Response to Question 224:

At the time of bid a good faith effort must be made to meet the DBE contract goal. Any DBE submitted must be DelDOT certified at time of bid. Since our DBE directory is a printed, quarterly document, it may not be comprehensive of all DelDOT DBE's that have been certified since the last published dated. To verify DBE status, please contact Amy Miller for at 302-760-2035 if a firm claims to be DelDOT DBE certified but is not listed in the directory.

Firms certified with other states must be certified by DelDOT at time of bid.

Question 223:

Specification sections 605500 and 605523 note fixed unit prices for removal of obstructions. Was is the intent for these to be line items in the schedule of prices or just noted for possible use after award?

Response to Question 223:

The fixed price for the removal/excavation of obstructions, including rock excavation is to be used in instances described in the respective special provisions and is not intended to be a separate line item.

Question 222:

Regarding Post-Tensioning Specification 602787, Section "Anchorages", second to last paragraph, pg 114: The first sentence indicates additional reinforcement needed to resist bursting and splitting stresses is the responsibility of the Contractor.

Per PTI Anchorage Zone Design, Section 5.2 "...the post-tensioning system supplier is responsible for the design of the anchorage device including any integral confinement reinforcement [Local Zone] but has no control over the design of the General Zone [nor does the Contractor]. General Zone

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

reinforcement which includes bursting and spalling reinforcement, should be included with the bid item for all other reinforcement steel. It is not part of the post-tensioning system.” AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specification, Section 5.10.9.2.4, defines similar requirements for the responsibility of the General Zone reinforcement.

Please clarify the intent of the Specification which essentially places the design of General Zone (reinforcement to resist bursting and splitting stresses) on the Contractor.

Response to Question 222:

The general zone reinforcement is included in the contract plans. The Engineer has designed the general zone for the introduction of concentrated forces from multiple anchorages. The Contractor (pt supplier) is responsible for designing the local zone reinforcement. The Contractor is also responsible for designing, testing and providing the bursting reinforcement (spirals, grillage, etc.) at/around each anchorage.

Question 221:

Please provide existing grades for the following MSE walls, as none currently is shown on the plans:

- Sheet 206 - Bridge S1: Wingwall III
- Sheet 264 - Bridge S2: Wingwall I (Between Sta 1245+58 to 1245+50)
- Sheet 317 - Bridge S3: Wingwall I & II
- Sheet 361 - Bridge S4: Wingwall III
- Sheet 405 - Bridge S5: Wingwall I
- Sheet 406 - Bridge S5: Wingwall III

Response to Question 221:

The approximate existing ground line is shown on the plans. In some cases, it is the same as the proposed ground line and is labeled accordingly

Question 220:

Please confirm the reinforcement length at the locations listed below. The height of the proposed wall seems too small to have the length of reinforcement that is required on the plans.

- Sheet 206 - Bridge S1: Wingwall IV (Height ranges from 4 ft - 35 ft and the reinforcement length is 38 LF)
- Sheet 264 - Bridge S2: Wingwall I (Height varies from 2 ft - 10 ft and the reinforcement length is 30LF)
- Sheet 264 - Bridge S2: Wingwall II (Height from Sta 1245+58 to 1245 +50 is approx 11 - 12 ft and the reinforcement length is 30 LF)
- Sheet 317 - Bridge S3: Wingwall I & II (Height is approx 12 - 14 ft and the reinforcement length is 26 LF)
- Sheet 318 - Bridge S3: Abutment B (Height approx 23 ft and the reinforcement length is 27 LF)
- Sheet 360 - Bridge S4: Sections of Wingwall I & II (Height < 15 ft and reinforcement length is 21 LF)
- Sheet 361 - Bridge S4: Abutment B, Wingwalls III & IV (Height < 15 ft and reinforcement length is 24.5 (LF)
- Sheet 405 - Bridge S5: Wingwall I (Height < 5 lf and reinforcement length is 33 LF)
- Sheet 406 - Bridge S5: Wingwall III (Height < 11 lf and reinforcement length is 32 LF)

Response to Question 220:

A note will added to the plans in an addendum, for the shorter wingwalls to specify that the soil reinforcing length is a function of the height of the walls, similar to what is specified for some of the retaining walls.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 219:

The legend on Sheet 208 for the minimum reinforcement zone width states that Wingwall I & III is 23.5 LF. Should Wingwall III actually be labeled Wingwall II?

Response to Question 219:

Yes, this will be updated in an addendum.

Question 218:

If the maximum fill height in Stage 1 is greater than the wall height, how far below the top of wall should the contractor end the stage 1 backfill? This occurs at the following locations:

Sheet 205 - Bridge S1: Abutment A and Sections of Wingwalls I & II

Sheet 206 - Bridge S1: Abutment B and Wingwalls III & IV

Sheet 264 - Bridge S2: Abutment A and Section of Wingwall II and all of Wingwall I

Sheet 265 - Bridge S2: Abutment B and Wingalls III & IV

Sheet 317 - Bridge S3: Abutment A and Wingwalls I & II

Sheet 318 - Bridge S3: Abutment B and Section of Wingwall III & all of Wingwall IV

Sheet 360 - Bridge S4: Abutment A and Sections of Wingwall I & II

Sheet 361 - Bridge S4: Abutment B and Wingwall II & IV

Sheet 405 - Bridge S5: Abutment A and Wingwalls I & II

Sheet 406 - Bridge S5: Abutment B and Wingwalls III & IV

Sheet 534 - MSE Wall 1

Sheet 538 - MSE Wall 2

Response to Question 218:

For those cases where the wall height is less than the maximum stage 1 fill height, then the total wall backfill can be placed in one stage.

Question 217:

How will the fill material required to bring the elevation of the subgrade for the MSE leveling pads to grade be paid? Fill is required below the MSE Leveling Pads at the following locations:

Sheet 206 - Bridge S1: Wingwall IV

Sheet 318 - Bridge S2: Wingwall IV

Sheet 360 - Bridge S3, Wingwall II

Sheet 361 - Bridge S3: Wingwall IV

Sheet 534 - MSE Wall 1

Sheet 556 - MSE Wall 6

Response to Question 217:

Borrow Type will be required in these areas. The quantity of Borrow Type B will be updated in a future addendum.

Question 216:

Please confirm that the quantities for the following bid items are correct. My totals for the fill material are much higher than the plan quantity. Bid items 602772 - Add'l fill in wedge @ MSE Walls 4, 6, & 8

Response to Question 216:

The quantities are currently being checked and will be adjusted in an addendum if necessary.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 215:

On Sheet 4 of 803, General Note 6 indicates “The name of the Delaware Registered Professional Engineer providing direction and supervision of the Site Reviewer . . . shall also be submitted to the Department at the time of bid.” The Prospective Bidder Notes 5 Submission Reminder does not require the submission of a Delaware Registered Professional Engineer. Please clarify if this is a contract requirement.

Response to Question 215:

The Site Reviewer and the name and company of the PE providing direction must be submitted to the Department by the apparent low bidder within ten (10) calendar days after the bid opening. Otherwise, this shall create a non-rebuttable presumption that the bid is non-responsive. The words “at the time of bid” will be removed from Note 6 in Addendum 4.

Question 214:

If the breakout sheet for a Lump Sum item lists a quantity of 3,500,000 lbs of structural steel for a particular bridge and the actual quantity is 4,000,000 lbs, please confirm that the contractor will be paid the additional 500,000 lbs times the breakout sheet unit price for that particular structure.

Response to Question 214:

On structural steel, it is the Department’s intent to pay only the Lump Sum bid. Any quantities of steel provided are for information only to assist the bidder with the relative magnitude of each structure. Unless there is a Design change to the structural steel after the time of bid, only the Lump Sum bid price will be paid for this item.

Question 213:

If the breakout sheet for a Lump Sum item fails to include a line item(s) that the specifications indicate should be a part of the lump sum and listed on a breakout sheet, please confirm that the contractor will be compensated for the missing item(s) as additional work.

Response to Question 213:

The breakout sheet includes the general components required to construct the lump sum item. The contractor is required to include the cost of furnishing and placing all materials and for all labor, tools, equipment and incidentals required to construct the work as shown on the plans and/or specified in the specifications in their lump sum bid.

Question 212:

We are not able to come up to the quantities shown on the Schedule of Items for 602007, PCC Pier Above Footing, Class A and 602017, PCC Parapet, Class A. Please verify your quantities and if possible, provide a breakdown by structure, for comparison purposes.

Response to Question 212:

We are currently in the process of checking the quantities. Any necessary adjustments will be provided by addendum.

Question 211:

Under what item is breaking up pavement and recompact as shown on several of the typical sections paid?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 211:

This work is to be performed in accordance with standard specification 202000.

Question 210:

There are no references to the use or location of Types A and B Borrow on the plans. Please provide.

Response to Question 210:

209002 Borrow Type B is to be used for undercut backfill in wet areas. All other undercut backfill areas shall be backfilled with 209001, Borrow Type A. Additionally, 209001, Borrow Type A shall be used as backfill material in the area of the pavement removal on the northwest loop ramp that is to receive the Interchange Plantings. See not 13 on sheet 681 (LS-02).

Question 209:

Please provide specifications for Bid Item 210, "Undercut Excavation, Patching."

Response to Question 209:

This work is covered under section 212 of the standard specifications. It is intended to be used in areas of pavement patching where undercutting is required as directed by the engineer.

February 4, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for new responses through February 4;
3, 5, 34, 46, 49, 51, 57, 58, 59, 61, 76, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96,
97, 98, 104, 105, 109, 114 through 120, 130, 133, and 136

Please see the following questions for revised responses; 178

Questions 179 through 208 are new questions and responses.

Question 208:

The MSE Wall Specifications and Contract Plans do not list the DELDOT pre-approved MSE wall designer/suppliers. Previous DELDOT projects listed the MSE Wall designer/supplier firms who meet the DELDOT requirements for MSE wall design and supply. Please provide the list of DELDOT approved MSE Wall designer/supplier firms.

Response to Question 208:

DelDOT does not maintain a list of approved MSE Wall suppliers. Bidders are required to submit an MSE wall system that can meet the requirements of the contract documents.

Question 207:

Please provide facing panel specifications (i.e. concrete and rebar requirements) for the MSE walls. The specification for MSE walls only provides requirements for the soil reinforcement and backfill. The plans provide concrete and rebar requirements for the leveling pads, coping and moment slabs.

Response to Question 207:

The MSE wall supplier is responsible for the fabrication details of the facing panels.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 206:

Regarding the post-tensioning anchor plates for Ramp C over SR7 and Ramp B over I95 NB: Under normal applications where Threadbar® anchor plates bear directly on concrete, A36 steel is common. Please clarify if A36 can be used for this application.

Response to Question 206:

A36 material may be used for this application.

Question 205:

The MSE Wall Specifications state the following:

All retaining wall components shall be designed for a minimum service life of 100 years.

The plans state in several locations a 75 year design life and a 100 year design life for MSE Walls. What design life should be used for the MSE retaining wall structures?

Response to Question 205:

Retaining wall plans will be updated to match the specification requirement of 100 years by addendum.

Question 204:

The MSE wall specification, section 602772 states the following:

External Stability: The responsibility for the global stability of a MSE structure will rest with the Contractor. Global stability refers to the overall rotational stability involving both the reinforced soil mass and native soil or rock.

Sliding, overturning, and bearing capacity shall be evaluated by the wall supplier. The allowable bearing capacity at the MSE walls shall be determined by the Contractor and submitted for approval by the Engineer.

Given that the department has provided the contractor access to the geotechnical report prepared by RKK/URS, and that the recommendations and analysis provided in the report pertains to Global Stability, Bearing Capacity, Settlement of the foundation soils subject to the loading of the MSE walls above, why is the responsibility for External Stability placed on the contractor and Bearing Capacity placed on the Wall Supplier?

Standard practice on DOT projects is for the MSE Wall Supplier to be responsible for Internal Stability design and the determination of Sliding and Overturning stability and calculation of the applied Bearing Pressure. The owner's geotechnical engineer has already evaluated the global stability of the proposed structures and the bearing Capacity of the foundation soils and made recommendations with regard to minimum soil reinforcement lengths, phased construction for foundation surcharging, settlement monitoring and the use of lightweight fill to minimize the loads on the foundation soils.

We respectfully request that the owner revise the External Stability/Global Stability requirement to be the Owner's responsibility, as well as the determination of foundation soils Bearing Capacity.

Response to Question 204:

Global Stability is the responsibility of the owner. Correction will be made to include an updated spec to address the comment by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 203:

Plan Sheet 470 no dimension is shown from Base Line to Girder line which is needed. It appears that it is 2'-4½" from the base line to G1.

Response to Question 203:

The horizontal radius is provided for each girder and the Baseline, the offset is 2'-4 ½".

Question 202:

Plan Sheet 470 shows jacking stiffeners but no details for them.

Response to Question 202:

The Jacking Stiffener is detailed the same as the Bearing Stiffener. Will address by addendum.

Question 201:

Plan Sheets 470, 471 and 472 show no intermediate diaphragms which results in an unsupported web length of 32.75 feet in a thin member. Has this been checked? We are concerned that when you place the concrete web the member is going to roll in from the weight or out from the hydrostatic pressure.

Response to Question 201:

The steel cross girder has been designed for an unsupported web length of 31' 1 ½" as shown in the plans; intermediate diaphragms are not required, except for the diaphragms per note 5 on Sheet 470. The cross girder has been designed to resist the hydrostatic pressure from concrete placement.

Question 200:

Plan Sheet 471 Cross girder diaphragm is missing dimensions and plate thickness.

Response to Question 200:

The cross girder diaphragm plate is a ¾" thick plate. Will address by addendum.

Question 199:

Plan Sheet 471 at bearing stiffener the plans indicate that there are some internal stiffeners parallel with the web plates but there are no dimensions for them.

Response to Question 199:

The stiffeners parallel to the webs are 1"x10" plates, 2 on each side welded to the main stiffener plate. Will address by addendum.

Question 198:

Plan Sheet 470 mentions a 3/8" end plate but there are no details for it.

Response to Question 198:

Will address by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 197:

Plan Sheet 472 mentions an 3/8" Cover plate that overhangs the top flanges by 3/4" but there is no detail as to how it is to be attached only when.

Response to Question 197:

Will address by addendum.

Question 196:

Plan Sheet 472 on the sequence the shoring needs to be removed once the beams are connected to allow it to rotate as the beams are loaded.

Response to Question 196:

That is correct, we will address by addendum.

Question 195:

Regarding Wall backfill Plan sheet R2-1, R3-1 & R16-01 please identify LWEF material and specification requirements.

Response to Question 195:

The CLSM is the LWEF as noted on the plans. Addendum No. 2 clarifies this issue.

Question 194:

R6-01 & R8-01 Wedge fill material is shown what material specification is required?

Response to Question 194:

The material in the wedge for R6 is shown as common borrow per the foundation notes. The soil properties has the common borrow labeled as No. 57 stone. This will be changed by addendum. The material in the wedge for R8 is shown in the foundation notes as No. 57 stone.

Question 193:

MSE Panel Finish Bridge notes sheet 266 typical note (The MSE Wall Panels Shall Receive An Architectural Finish) Same on sheet 533 typical note What is the Architectural finish required ? Is the finish also to be stained ?

Response to Question 193:

The information on the pattern and finish will be included by addendum.

Question 192:

Spec section 602772b. Completed walls shall have a concrete facing with a finish or aesthetic treatment as approved by the engineer. What type of finish and treatment, and will there be a stain required?

Response to Question 192:

The information on the pattern and finish will be included by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 191:

Sheets 211, 212, 213 & 368 have variable radius on each side of the columns. Can the radius be changed to a common value such as 30'-0" to prevent the need for custom forming the top of four columns? That would be eight separate forms when two would do.

Response to Question 191:

Contractor shall base their bid on the proposed pier as depicted in the contract documents.

Question 190:

Sheet 387 Bridge S5 shows that the tube piles have concrete 18'-3" deep. However the ground elevation is 29.95' below abutment A and 19.65 below abutment B. After the piles are driven you will have a gap between the 18'-3" and the ground. How do you want this filled? This condition exists at the other abutments through the project.

Response to Question 190:

The length of the concrete in the top of the pipe piles was determined based upon the bond between the concrete and the steel pile, so as to effectively transfer the loads from the pile to the pile cap. The gap between this concrete fill and the ground line does not need to be filled.

Question 189:

The piers referenced in pay item 602007 for Bridge 1, 4 have different sized radii on the haunch. This would require additional formwork for the project. Would DelDOT approve a standard sized radius, say 30', for Bridges 1 and 4?

Response to Question 189:

The piers are to be constructed as shown on the plans.

Question 188:

With regard to Items #602785 and #602786, are the areas located at the top of the pier columns and outside of the masonry pads for S1 Pier 2 and S4 Pier 1 to be poured in conjunction with the integral pier caps, or can they be poured prior to the setting of girders? Please clarify.

Response to Question 188:

Those areas are to be poured in conjunction with the integral pier caps. Pouring the area outside of the temporary masonry pads prior to setting the girders would eliminate the temporary masonry pads that are provided for the erection of the girders.

Question 187:

On page 306 of the proposal for Bid Item 749560 –“ Installation of Jersey Barrier Mounted I-Beam”; the Special Provision seems to indicate a “supply item” rather than an installation item; this is reflected in the first paragraph and also in the Basis of Payment. On page 305; Bid Item 749559 seems to be for the supply of this item. Please clarify the intent of Bid Item 749560.

New Response to Question 187:

749559 is for the supply of the barrier post and attachment equipment. 749560 is for the installation. ~~The specifications will be updated by addendum.~~

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 186 :

The Special Provision for Temporary Markings, Tape – pages 292 thru 294 indicates under Method of Measurement that “Removal or obliteration of pavement markings in construction work zones will not be measured for payment, but shall be considered incidental to the work.” On page 295 of the proposal under Special Provision 748530- Removal of Pavement Striping indicates in the description “This work consists of removal of pavement markings of all kinds including paint, TAPE, etc. ----. Please clarify how the removal of Temporary Markings, Tape is paid for. In addition, please clarify how the removal of all pavement markings that require removal will be paid for.

Response to Question 186:

The cost of removing temporary tape installed under items 748525-527 shall be included in the items 748525-527 as specified in the SP. The removal of pavement markings not covered under item(s)748525-527 shall be be paid under item 748530 Removal of Pavement Striping. The reference to tape in 748530 is for inlaid tape, hatching, stop lines, etc.

Questions 185:

For Bridges S1 thru S5, there is a pouring sequence shown for construction of the decks, however, both S6 and S8 do not specify a pouring sequence. Is there a pouring sequence that DELDOT requires to be followed for construction of the decks for Bridges S6 & S8? Please clarify.

Response to Question 185:

The pour sequence is identified on S6-42 to S6-45. The callout is located in the plan view. The pour sequence for S-8 will be provided by addendum.

Question 184:

The Special Provision on page 184 of the proposal for Bid Item 619501 – Production Pile Restrike and Bid item 619502 – Test Pile Restrike indicates that Production Pile Restrikes shall be bid at a fixed price of \$500.00 each and that Test Pile Restrikes payment will be made at a fixed price of \$1000.00 per calendar day. In the Expedite file and the hard copy of the Schedule of Prices; neither Line Item 1020 or 1030 that correspond to the above referenced bid items have fixed prices. Please clarify the intent for payment and include fixed prices as required in the Schedule of Prices. Please clarify.

Response to Question 184:

It is the intent that Items 619501 and 619502 be paid at the fixed price as described in the Special Provisions. The Bid Tab will be updated to reflect a fixed price by addendum.

Question 183:

On page 188 of the proposal the Special Provision for Bid Item 623002 – Prestressed Reinforced Concrete Members, Box Beams indicates there is a breakout sheet required. There appears not to be a breakout sheet included; please advise. Please consider not requiring another breakout sheet.

Response to Question 183:

No breakout sheet will be required for this item. This will be corrected by addendum.

Question 182:

The Special Provision on pages 205 and 206 of the proposal for Portable Impact Attenuator partial repair will be paid under the repaired/replaced part(s) as listed in the breakout sheet for “Install Portable Impact

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Attenuator” and “Furnish Portable Impact Attenuator”. There appears to be no breakout sheet; please clarify the intent. Please consider not requiring another breakout sheet.

New Response to Question 182:

~~Breakout sheets for items 720532 and 720534 will be included by addendum.~~

Breakout Sheets for items 720532 and 720534 were removed and replaced with required “Forms” for both items, in Addendum 4.

Question 181:

The Special Provision on page 226 of the proposal for Furnish and Maintain Truck Mounted Attenuator, Type II indicates that if the TMA is damaged at anytime throughout the life of the contract; repairs and/or replacement, if necessary, shall be the responsibility of the Contractor with cost to be incidental to this pay item. Please consider payment in some fashion for TMA’s damaged by the public through no fault of the Contractor. Please advise.

Response to Question 181:

The Contractor shall be responsible for keeping the TMA in effective crashworthy condition for which it is designed throughout the life of the contract as specified in Special Provision 743537.

Question 180 :

On page 32 of the Bid Proposal Forms; “Special Bidding Procedure”; the Contractor is required to fill in the number of calendar days proposed by the bidder for the anticipated adverse weather included within the total number of calendar days specified in part B. Is the number of adverse weather days something the Contractor is suppose to come up with on his own or is the intent to use Table I on page 340 of the proposal to arrive at the days to be filled in; please clarify. Also; please clarify the intent for requiring these days to be filled in at bid time.

Response to Question 180:

~~Bidders are to determine the number of weather days for their bid by using Table I in Special Provision 763564—Special Bidding Procedure. The bidder is to use the Department’s anticipated Notice to Proceed date along with their total calendar days for construction to determine the correct amount of weather days. The Department will review, and correct if necessary, the total weather days submitted by each bidder. The intent for requiring the contractor to include this at the time of bid is due to the fact the number of calendar days bid affects the total weather days allowed and must be taken into account for bid comparisons.~~

New Response to Question 180:

Refer to the Response to Question A3Q20.

Question 179:

As part of the Certification pages that must be filled in by the Bidder it requires the Contractor to acknowledge each Addenda and the date it was issued or acknowledged. Question is what date(s) is required for each Addenda; the date of the Addenda or the date the Contractor acknowledges the Addenda or both; there seems to be conflicting directions in different sections of the proposal; please clarify. Also; please confirm that the Contractor only has to acknowledge the Addenda and not actually attach the the Addenda to the Bid Proposal Forms.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 179:

It is intended the date the contractor acknowledges the Addenda is the date entered on the Certification page. However, there is no right or wrong date, the importance of a date entry is to ensure all information included in each addendum is included in the contractors bid. If no date is entered, the bid will be declared non-responsive.

In addition, there is space provided on the CERTIFICATION page to insert the Posted Date of the final Questions and Answers. The Final Posted Date is the latest Posted Date of the Questions and Answers one day prior to Bid Date. This final Posted Date must be submitted on the Certification page or your bid will be considered Non-responsive and not considered for award.

January 31, 2011

NOTE:

Please see the following questions for new responses through January 31;
50, 56, 60, 77 through 86, 94, 113, 147, 148

Questions 150 through 178 are new questions and responses.

Question 178-1:

Q&A #178 states that "The anticipated NTP is now June 13, 2011".

In light of the "Bid Date Notice" posted on February 18, 2011, which is pushing the bid date by 6 to 8 weeks presumably beyond the original bid date of March 3, 2011, what should we assume is the revised anticipated NTP?

Response to Question 178-1:

The anticipated NTP has not changed at this time. Any change in NTP it will be shown in an upcoming addendum. Please refer to 'Response to Question 178'.

Question 178:

When is the anticipated notice to proceed?

Response to Question 178:

The anticipated NTP is now June 13, 2011 September 5, 2011.

New Response to Question 178

The anticipated NTP is now September 12, 2011.

Question 177:

For a joint venture, are we required to register the joint venture using the DelDOT registry for construction contractors and vendors forms? This form does not seem setup for registering a joint venture. We thought the certification form for joint ventures and bid bond for joint ventures, handed out at the prebid, would be sufficient and we would not have to fill out the registry. Please advise.

Response to Question 177:

The Standard Specifications (§102.06) require either the proposed Joint Venture partnership, or one of the Joint Venture partners be registered with the Department.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 176:

Please refer to Note 1 on Plan Sheet No. 78 (CP-14) which says "MODIFY EXISTING OVERHEAD SIGN STRUCTURE, SEE DETAIL SHEET XX." The note refers to the structure located at I95 Construction Baseline Sta. 118+00 which is within 100 feet of another existing Overhead Sign Structure (OSS), both of which are shown on Sheet No. 724 (SSC-14) and designated EXOH-1 and EXOH-2 respectively. The note on SSC-14 for EXOH-1 says "EXTEND EXISTING SIGN STRUCTURE TO ACCOMMODATE PROPOSED ROADWAY WID(EN)ING." Please verify that modification/widening of EXOH-1 is required and provide the sheet number where the modification/widening can be found.

Response to Question 176:

EXOH-1 is to be removed by the contractor. DelDOT Traffic Signal Construction will be responsible for the removal and re-installation of the DMS sign. The plans will be updated to clarify this issue by addendum.

Question 175:

Another existing OSS also designated as EXOH-1, is shown on Plan Sheet No. 723 (SSC-13) over I95 SB at approx. Sta. 105+33 on the I95 Const. Baseline (approx. 539+33 Ramp B1 Baseline). Both locations can't be EXOH-1 and it is difficult to understand what signs are to be installed on each. We are further confused by Plan Sheet Nos. 730 and 731 which indicate a sign panel designation OH-18(B) with a reference to Sheet No. SSC-14, a sign panel designation OH-18(A) also with a reference to Sheet No. SSC-14, a sign panel designation EXOH-1 with a reference to Sheet No. SSC-13 but no OH-18 Sign designation on Plan Sheet No. 734 and no OSS OH-18 shown on SSC-14 (Sheet No. 724). Additionally, the Symbol DND (DO NOT DISTURB) appears on Plan Sheet No. 77 (CP-13) at the existing OSS located over I95 SB at approx. Sta. 105+33 on the I95 Const. Baseline. Please clarify the structure numbers and what signs go on each.

Response to Question 175:

EXOH-1 as shown on SSC-13 shall remain; the sign panels will be replaced (the EXOH-1 designation is correct at this location). The OSS labeled OHEX-2 on sheet SSC-14 should be labeled OH-18. The DND symbol shall be deleted as the sign panel will be replaced. The plans will be updated to reflect these clarifications by addendum.

Question 174:

An existing OSS is shown on Plan Sheet No. 725 (SSC-15) but there is no note to remove it as there is on other SSC plan sheets; please advise if this is to remain or be removed.

Response to Question 174:

The existing sign is to remain.

Question 173:

Plan Sheet No. 725 (SSC-15) shows End Contract 28-090-02 Station 565+00 (as do numerous other plan sheets, i.e. 1, 2, 79, 161 & 698) but additional work is shown on Sheet Nos. 726 and 727. Shouldn't the limits of the Contract be extended to include these areas? The same is true for Plan Sheet Nos. 711 & 728 (SSC-1 & SSC-18) along SR 1.

Response to Question 173:

Due to required changes to approaching signs the limits of construction for signing is different than the roadway contract.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 172:

Note 4 and Note 1 on Plan Sheet Nos. 727 & 728 (SSC-17 & SSC-18) say "ALL EXISTING OVERHEAD AND BRIDGE MOUNTED SIGNS AND STRUCTURES SHALL BE REMOVED BY THE CONTRACTOR WITHIN THE CONTRACT LIMITS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED." There are two such signs on SSC-17 and one on SSC-18 that are NOT WITHIN THE CONTRACT LIMITS and are NOT NOTED to be removed; please advise if these structures are to be removed.

Response to Question 172:

Due to required changes to approaching signs the limits of construction for signing is different than the roadway contract.

Question 171:

Please refer to Plan Sheet No. 719 (SSC-9) and verify that the match line reference to Sheet SSC-16 in the upper right corner, should be to SSC-17.

Response to Question 171:

Yes it should be SSC-17

Question 170:

Note 6 on Plan Sheet Nos. 720 & 723 (SSC-10 & SSC-13) says "ALL EXISTING OVERHEAD AND BRIDGE MOUNTED SIGNS AND STRUCTURES SHALL BE REMOVED BY THE CONTRACTOR WITHIN THE CONTRACT LIMITS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED." Sign structures EXC-1 shown on SSC-10 and EXOH-1 shown on SSC-13 are existing overhead structures that are to have new signs mounted to them, but they are not otherwise noted to remain. Please verify that these two structures are to remain.

Response to Question 170:

Yes they are to remain.

Question 169:

In regards to the 15 items with breakout sheets, there are several items that we do not agree with your quantities. Your quantities are listed as approx. The Excel sheet is protected and does not allow us to change your quantity. It is difficult for us to bid your differing quantities and sum up to the total we want to bid for the lump sum of that breakout sheet. Can you change the requirement of turning these breakout sheets in with the bid and permit the low bidder to submit within 10 calendar days of notification of apparent low bidder status? Or will you reissue the breakout sheets with the capability for us to change quantities?

Response to Question 169:

We are currently in the process of verifying the quantities in the breakout sheets and we will reissue the breakout sheets if necessary by addendum.

Question 168:

In order to expedite the process of ordering material for this project before the award and notice to proceed, will you issue a letter of intent to award, say a week after notification of apparent low bidder, so we can begin the process of ordering material that have long lead times for delivery?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 168:

No. The Department understands the desire to order as soon as possible, however, we do not anticipate issuing an intent to award letter, or authorizing any expenditure until the bid has been reviewed. This will likely be at least two to four weeks after the bid date.

Question 167:

On Sheet 64, Barrier Schedule, Barrier 13 reads " Double Face, Bifurcated Type 1 (720655)". However, the barrier description corresponds to item number 720651, whereas Item 720655 corresponds to Single, Face, Modified Type 2 barrier. In addition Sheet 25, Typical Sections for Ramp B, shows the barrier from station 405+84.60 to 415+66.08 RT to be item "OO"-which corresponds to Item 720651 Double Face, Bifurcated Type 1. Please advise whether Item is 720655 or 720651.

Response to Question 167:

This will be addressed in an addendum.

Question 166:

On Sheet 64, Barrier Schedule, Barrier 7 reads " Double Face, Bifurcated Type 2 (720652)". However, Sheet 25, Typical Sections for Ramp B, shows the barrier from station 403+31.40 to 405+64.71 LT to be item "OO"-which corresponds to Item 720651 Double Face, Bifurcated Type 1. In addition, Sheet 24, Typical Sections for Ramp A from station 1279+57.18 to 1281+12.01 LT to be item "PP"-720652 Double Face Bifurcated Type 2, and from station 1281+12.01 to 1286+11.18 LT to be item "T"-720512 Single Face. Please advise barrier type from station 403+31.40 to 405+64.71 LT Ramp B, as well as 1279+57.18 to ~1281+85 LT Ramp A.

Response to Question 166:

This will be addressed in an addendum.

Question 165:

On Sheet 64, Barrier Schedule, Barrier 10 reads " Single Face, Modified Type 4 (720657)". However, Sheet 25, Typical Sections for Ramp B, shows the barrier from station 405+84.60 to 415+66.08 LT to be item "W"-which corresponds to Item 720655 Single Face, Modified Type 2. Please advise whether Item is 720655 or 720657.

Response to Question 165:

This will be addressed by addendum.

Question 164:

On Sheet 71, Barrier Schedule, Barrier 71 reads " Single Face (720512)" and On Sheet 75, Barrier Schedule, Barrier 95 reads "Single face (720512)". However, Sheet 29, Typical Sections for Ramp B1, shows the barrier from station 504+10.34 to 510+31.40 LT to be item "OO"-which corresponds to Item 720651 Double Face, Bifurcated Type 1. Please advise whether Item is 720512 or 720651.

Response to Question 164:

This will be addressed by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 163:

The earthwork summary on sheet 5 of the plans shows 48,234 CY's of unsuitable material. What was considered unsuitable to come up with this quantity. Please provide a breakdown of quantity and location of the unsuitable material that was used to arrive at the above total. Also; there is a "-" in front of the 48234 CY unsuitable quantity in the Earthwork Summary; I assume this is material that has to be wasted; please confirm.

Response to Question 163:

Materials that fail to meet the requirements Section 209 and/or as described in note 3 of the Earthwork Summary are considered to be unsuitable. This material is to be wasted.

Question 162:

Note 3 in the Earthwork Summary on page 5 of the plans indicates that undercut soils are "unsuitable"; how much of the 48234 CY of unsuitable material is for undercut excavation and how is it paid for; please clarify.

Response to Question 162:

Undercut is to be paid for under Item 212000 Undercut Excavation and is estimated to be 2500 CY. (see line item 0200 in the bid tab)

Question 161:

Note 3 in the Earthwork Summary on page 5 of the plans indicates that Bituminous Pavement is unsuitable. Can broken up bituminous pavement be used for embankment on this project; it appears that the Standard Specification allows for its use as embankment; please advise. Same question applies to broken up concrete.

Response to Question 161:

Dependent upon the Contractor's construction sequencing Broken bituminous concrete shall be permitted in embankments, with approval of the Engineer and as outlined in Section 202 of the Standard Specifications.

Question 160:

The Earthwork Summary Table on sheet 5 of the plans under shows a quantity of 233202 CY of "Excavation Meeting Borrow Type 'F' "; Does all the embankment on the project have to meet requirement for Borrow Type 'F' including the materials excavated from the site? Are there any materials from onsite excavations that are anticipated to be unsuitable and suitable for Embankment; if so please provide additional information that will aid in determining this quantity and location.

Response to Question 160:

Embankments shall be constructed in accordance with Section 202.05 of the Standard Specifications. See the Earthwork Summary for the volumes of anticipated on-site excavations that are anticipated to be unsuitable and suitable for Embankment.

Question 159:

The Earthwork Summary for "Embankment Requirements shows 316315 CY Borrow Type 'F' required; is it anticipated that all the material from onsite excavations will be suitable for embankment and meet the Borrow Type 'F' requirement or does the onsite materials not have to meet the Borrow Type 'F' requirement; please clarify.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 159:

See the Earthwork Summary on page 5 for the anticipated volumes of material anticipated to be unsuitable and for the volume of material anticipated to meet the minimum requirements of Borrow Type F.

Question 158:

Please clarify under which bid item the moment slab & parapet on MSE Wall 2 is to be paid.

Response to Question 158:

The plans will be clarified in an addendum.

Question 157:

Details on plan sheet 182 show rebar in the portion of Item 501006 –PCC Pavement, 12” that overlaps the MSE panels. Please clarify whether this rebar is included in Item 501006 or Item 604000-Epoxy Coated Reinf. Bars

Response to Question 157:

The reinforcing steel for this area is included in Item 604000.

Question 156:

With regard to the bridge abutments that require 2 different types of materials for backfill, there is some confusion with what is desired in the overlap areas of backfill limits for the abutments and their respective wing walls. With specified heights stated for LWEF, it is not clear on what governs for the backfill limits within the overlap of the abutment backfill with its adjacent wing wall backfill, particularly with the different level pad elevations. Is it DelDOT’s intention to maintain a constant and specific elevation for the LWEF throughout these overlap areas behind the abutments? Please clarify.

Response to Question 156:

This issue will be addressed in an addendum.

Question 155:

On page 112 of the proposal under Method of Measurement and Basis of Payment it refers to 6000 psi; should this be 8000 psi; please clarify.

Response to Question 155:

It should be 8,000 psi. This Special provision will be updated in the addendum.

Question 154:

Will Portable P.C.C. Safety Barrier that is not made of Portland Cement Concrete but satisfies all other requirements of Special Provision 720567 (including but not limited to being NCHRP Report 350 certified and the USDOT FHA August 28, 1998 memorandum regarding Crash Tested Work Zone Traffic Control Devices) be permitted to be used on this project?

Response to Question 154:

No. The item is entitled “Portable PCC Safety Barrier”, PCC being Portland Cement Concrete.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 153:

Site Reviewer – Does the Site Reviewer need to be an employee of the General Contractor or can a subcontractor/consultant/DBE be utilized for this requirement?

Response to Question 153:

The certified site reviewer may be a member of the contractor, sub-contractor, or consultant of the prime contractor's team. This question is addressed on pages 10-11 of the prebid meeting minutes.

Question 152:

Given the magnitude of this project, please consider making the Breakout Sheets a post bid submission by the apparent low bidder. With steel fabricators making pricing changes up to minutes before bid time, it makes it extremely difficult completing the breakout sheets correctly. Currently there are 75 line items in the Breakdown Sheets for the 2 Sign Structure Lump Sum Bid Items. This would require a major effort should a fabricator change pricing within the final hour prior to bid time.

Response to Question 152:

The Department will not accept breakout sheets after submission of the bids. The Department considers breakout sheets part of the required documents to be submitted with the bid. The breakout sheets are reviewed by the Department along with all other required bid documents to determine the responsible, responsive, low bidder. We have added a Steel Price Cost Adjustment Special Provision to the proposal.

Question 151:

Please consider including a minimum number of calendar days that contractors may utilize in the Special A + B bidding procedure. Without a minimum requirement, the apparent low bidder by formula could manipulate the system resulting in a substantially inflated contract award price that possibly far exceeds DelDOT's current budget.

Response to Question 151:

The number of days bid by the contractor does not affect the contract award price. The number of days bid only affects; when liquidated damages may begin; and the calculation used to determine the responsible, responsive, low bidder.

Question 150:

Section 763 Initial Project expense indicates to include costs for obtaining all required insurance. Where can we locate the current contract insurance requirements?

Response to Question 150:

Delaware Code § 6929 requires each successful bidder to purchase adequate insurance for the performance of the contract. The Department has no specifications beyond this requirement.

January 28, 2011

Question 149:

Please refer to Notes 1 and 2 on Plan Sheet No. 194A and verify that the missing Special Provision Numbers are 202505 and 202518 for Note 1 and 202514 for Note 2.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 149:

This has been corrected in Addendum No. 2.

Question 148:

Please verify that Station 158+15 for Piezometer No. S-6-VP-4 shown in the chart on Plan Sheet No. 194A, should read 458+15.

Response to Question 148:

This is correct. Plan Sheet No. 194A will be updated by addendum to read 458+15.

Question 147:

According to Special Provision 202514 Piezometer, under Construction Methods: Installation, the depths of the vibrating wire piezometers are to be "as specified on the project plans" however, no such information can be found. Please direct us to the location where this information is or provide it separately.

Response to Question 147:

Plan Sheet No. 194A will be updated by addendum to include depth of installation.

Question 146:

Will there be any available space at the maintenance yard on Chapman Road for the contractor to use on this project? Can the field office be set up here?

Response to Question 146:

No, there is no available space at the DelDOT Chapman Road site.

Question 145:

Will as built plans for the existing bridge to be removed under this contract over SR 7 @ Sta 625+50 be made available prior to the bid due date?

Response to Question 145:

Yes, this information is included in the Supplemental Bid Information.

Question 144:

Please refer to the fourth paragraph under Reinforcing Steel General Notes on Drawings R7-01 and R10-1 for MSE Retaining Walls which states that all reinforcing steel in the parapet and moment slab shall be epoxy coated. Reinforcing steel details however, on Drawing Nos. R7-06, R7-07, R10-04 & R10-05, indicate that bars marked MS502, MS503, MS504, MS506 & MS506 are to be plain uncoated; please clarify.

Response to Question 144:

All bars in the barrier and moment slab shall be epoxy coated. The plans will be updated by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 143:

Please refer to Drawings R1-1, R1-2, R3-1 & R3-2 where a conflict in the dimension of the thickness of the heel for the PCC Pavement, along the Front Face of MSE Walls occurs. On R1-1 (R3-1) the call out note on the Typical Section says that elevations are given at the flow line which is shown to be 1'-6" from the bottom of the heel, but on the Developed Elevation on R1-2 (R3-2) the flow line is shown to be 2'-6" above the bottom of the heel; please clarify.

Response to Question 143:

The plans will be updated by addendum to address these issues.

Question 142:

Please clarify under which items the moment slab and F shape barrier on top of the MSE walls are paid. The specs indicate that they are to be paid under 602773, however the quantities shown on the breakout sheet for this item do not concur with this. Furthermore, items have not been included on this breakout sheet for all of the walls that have moment slabs and barriers.

Response to Question 142:

The specification and breakout sheet will be updated by addendum to address this issue.

Question 141:

Please confirm that the Controlled Low Strength Material discussed in specification section 209510 is to be used at the MSE walls locations noted on the plan sheets as LWEF.

Response to Question 141:

The CLSM is the LWEF as noted on the plans. The plans will be updated by addendum to address this issue.

Question 140:

Please refer to Drawings S6-23 and S6-24 regarding the Bearing Stiffener with respect to the following: Please verify that a Bearing Stiffener is to be placed at the locations where Jacking and Erection Stiffeners are shown.

Response to Question 140:

The drawings will be updated by addendum to address these issues.

Question 139:

Please provide the thickness and sizes of all Bearing Stiffener plates. 3) What is the size, thickness and limits of the plate shown at the top of the Bearing Stiffener detail on S6-24, and how are the 1-1/2" x 24" Top Flange plates of the Cross Girder to be joined to the Bearing Stiffener top plate?

Response to Question 139:

The drawings will be updated by addendum to address these issues.

Question 138:

No openings are shown at the bottom of the Bearing Stiffeners to allow for passage of 1-3/4" dia. Grade 75 all thread rebar, used for longitudinal reinforcing in the Cross girder. Please advise if the threaded bars are to be anchored and terminate at the stiffeners closest to the Ramp B Construction Baseline, or explain how they are to pass thru the Bearing Stiffeners.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 138:

The drawings will be updated by addendum to address these issues.

Question 137:

Please provide a thickness for the Cross Girder Diaphragm plate shown on Drawing S6-24.

Response to Question 137:

The drawings will be updated by addendum to address these issues.

Question 136:

Please refer to the Special Provisions for Items 602717 thru 602723 which can be found on Proposal Page 90. Only one of these items, 602717, appears on the Plans and in the Schedule of Items. Please verify that the other six items do not pertain to this project.

Response to Question 136:

Only Item 602717 is applicable to this project.

Question 135:

In the Schedule of Bid Items and the list of Standard Construction Items (last modified on 10/18/2010), the description for Item 720512 is "P.C.C. SAFETY BARRIER PERMANENT, DOUBLE FACE" however, on the Plan Sheet Nos. 6 thru 48, the description for Item 720512 is "... SINGLE FACE" and is shown as such on the drawings. In addition, the Barrier Schedule appearing on Plan Sheet Nos. 63, 64, 86, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75 & 76 also says "SINGLE FACE" for 720512. Please clarify.

Response to Question 135:

The correct item for this work is 720529, PCC safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 134:

In the Proposal, Special Provision Item 602773- PCC Masonry for Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls says the work consists of "the construction of cast-in-place concrete coping, moment slab and barrier of mechanically stabilized earth walls." This item is to be paid as a lump sum, the basis of which is to be the quantities listed on the breakout sheet for the various walls under this item.

However, Typical Sections shown on Plan Sheet Nos. 23, 26, 27, 32, 33, 40 and 41 indicate by the symbol J that the Barrier (Parapet) and Moment Slab (where present) are to be paid under Item 602017, PCC Masonry, Parapet, Class A. In addition, except for Item 1- Wall 2 Concrete, the quantities indicated on Breakout Sheet 3 are insufficient to include the volumes of moment slabs or barriers of the other MSE walls.

In addition, if the Special Provision is correct, quantities for Wall Nos.1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 & 15 need to be added to Breakout Sheet 3; if the Typical Sections are correct, the quantity for Wall No. 2 needs to be zero. Please clarify.

Response to Question 134:

The typical sections are correct. The specification for Item 602733 will be updated in a future addendum to include only the coping concrete. The breakout sheet will be updated in a future addendum to remove Wall 2 concrete but to also include the walls at the bridges.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 133:

Special Provision Item 208500, Flowable Fill, says that the work is to be performed at locations as specified in the Plans and as directed by the Engineer. The only place that I can find any of this work is at Abutment 1 of S9, Road A over Route 7.

In order to estimate the cost of this work properly, I need to know if the entire 105 CY quantity is for work at the above mentioned location. If not, please advise where I can find any other locations and please provide the quantity for each.

Response to Question 133:

In addition to the work at Abutment No.1 of S9 flowable fill is to be used to fill existing pipes that are to be abandoned and the height of fill being placed above them is too great to simply bulkhead them. The quantity at S9 is 55 CY and the quantity for filling the pipes is 105 CY. The total quantity of 105 CY will be adjusted to 160 CY in the upcoming addendum.

Question 132:

In the Schedule of Items and the list of Standard Construction Items (last modified on 10/18/2010) the description for Item 602785 is "P.C.C. MASONRY, SUBSTRUCTURE, 6000 PSI" and for Item 602786 it is " P.C.C. MASONRY, SUBSTRUCTURE, 8000 PSI", however for Item 602785, on Drawing S4-2 the description is "POST-TENSIONED PIER CAP" and on Drawing S6-2 the description is "POST-TENSIONED PIER CAP, CROSS-GIRDER". With respect to Item 602786 the description on Drawings S1-2, S2-2 and S3-2 is "POST-TENSIONED PIER CAP". Please clarify which portions of the structures are to be paid under each item in the Schedule of Items.

Response to Question 132:

The plans will be updated by addendum to clarify the pay items.

Question 131-1:

With respect to Q&A #131 (see below) which was just answered on 2/14/11, it is our opinion that the description in the "Schedule of Items" for Bid Item #602011 needs to be modified to match the intent of Note 3 in the General Structure Notes to eliminate any confusion about payment. Our concern is that it could be interpreted that the payment for the abutment footing concrete is payable under Bid Item #602011 rather than #602015. Please advise if this will be done.

Response to Questions 131-1:

Note 3 will be modified by addendum to clarify where each specific pay item (including its description) is to be used.

Question 131:

In the Schedule of Items and the list of Standard Construction Items (last modified on 10/18/2010) the description for 602011 is "PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE MASONRY, SUBSTRUCTURE, CLASS A" and for 602015 it is " PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE MASONRY, ABUTMENT ABOVE FOOTING, CLASS A ", however, on Drawings S1-2, S2-2, S3-2, S4-2, S5-5 and S6-2 the descriptions for 602011 and 602015 are "PIER FOOTING, TOP OF PIER PILES" and "ABUTMENT, TOP OF ABUTMENT PILES" respectively. If it is DelDot's intent to pay for the pier footing and pile concrete under one pay item and the abutment and pile concrete under another pay item, shouldn't there be a special provision explaining that? Since the work of filling piles with concrete is much different than placing footing and abutment concrete, we request a separate pay item be established for concrete at the top of piles. Please clarify what gets paid under which item.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 131:

Note 3 of the General Notes is meant to be a description of where that particular pay item is to used and is not intended to be the description of the pay item number. No additional pay item will be created for the concrete in the top of the piles. Payment shall be as noted in the plans.

Question 130:

On Page i of the Bid Proposal, there is a requirement that the ATSSA Certification be submitted within 10 calendar days of bid opening. However, on page 318 of the special provisions (763500), they require this certification to be turned in with the bid package. Please clarify.

Response to Question 130:

The ATSSA Certification is to be submitted by the apparent low bidder within ten (10) calendar days after the bid opening. This will be corrected by addendum.

Question 129:

According to the Pay Item schedule and Specifications Item 720512 is described as double-faced barrier however in the Drawing and in the typical section (Sheet 182 of 803) it is referenced as a single-faced barrier. Which is correct?

Response to Question 129:

The correct item for this work is 720529, PCC safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 128:

On plan sheet 713, Pay Item 748535 is referenced however there is no reference to this item in the Pay Item schedule in the Specifications. Is this considered an additional pay Item or does it fall under a different pay Item?

Response to Question 128:

The schedule of items will be updated to include this item by addendum. The quantity for Item 748535 is 180 LF.

Question 127:

For the erosion and sediment control plans (sheets 660 to 673C) the full project limits do not appear to be shown. However on the MOT plans (sheets 642 to 665) these erosion control devices are shown. Should the contractor assume that what is shown on the MOT plans is what is going to be constructed?

Response to Question 127:

The complete assessment of all of the required erosion and sediment control devices are shown on the roll plans designated as sheets 642 through 655. The plans sheets 660 through 673 are enlargements and details of those areas within the project site where temporary pavement is being installed.

Question 126:

On Sheet 627, in the notes section "2. Natural Resource Issue", note "B." states that "Temporary wetlands are to be restored to original grades and seeded using the following seed mix (Temporary Grass Seeding-

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

wet ground 734018)". However there is no item 734018 in the bid pricing. Where should the contractor include the pricing for this work?

Response to Question 126:

The schedule of items will be updated to include this item by addendum.

Question 125:

On the MSE wall break out sheet one of the items listed is MSE Wall 16 light weight fill in straps. Several of the other walls call for light weight material to be used but they are not included on the break out sheet. Should the break out item for Light Weight Fill in straps for wall 16 be incidental to wall 16 as is the case for MSE walls 2 and 3.

Response to Question 125:

The lightweight fill (CLSM) callout will be removed from the breakout sheet for walls as well as the additional fill in the wedge items by addendum. All fill material is considered incidental to the MSE wall item.

Question 124-1:

In the Q&A, several responses dealing with Item 602733 – PCC Masonry for MSE Walls indicate the item will be revised to only include coping concrete. If this occurs, please advise under what item the moment slabs, MSE barrier walls, etc will be paid? The response to Question 44 suggests the thinking might be Item 602017 & 604000.

Response to Question 124-1:

In addendum #3 all of the breakout sheets, specification and plan sheets reflect the payment for the coping to be paid for under Item 602733 and the barrier, moment slab and PCC barrier to be paid for under Item 602017.

Question 124:

On the PCC Masonry for MSE Walls it appears that these quantities are for the moment slab and/or coping that is on the top of the walls. However, walls 7 and 16 also have moment slabs but are not included in the break out sheet and are a significant quantity of concrete. Should there be additional break out items added for walls 7 and 16.

Response to Question 124:

The specification for Item 602733 will be updated by addendum to include only the coping concrete. Breakout sheet will be updated by addendum to remove Wall 2 concrete but to also include the walls at the bridges.

Question 123:

On sheets 62 through 79, Removal of PCC Barrier is listed as item number 758000. This pay item does not appear to match the scope of work in this pay item. Should this scope of work be included in item 211523 which is titled "Removal of PCC Barrier"?

Response to Question 123:

The removal of Barrier shall be paid for under 211523.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 122:

On plan sheets 6 thru 48 Pay Item 712005 is referenced as Class R-4 Rip Rap; however there is no reference to this item in the Pay Item schedule in the Specifications. Is this considered an additional pay Item or does it fall under a different pay Item?

Response to Question 122:

The schedule of items will be updated to include this item in by addendum.

Question 121:

Please refer to Section 812.04c.1.of the Standard Specifications and clarify the 22" maximum slump for slip-form paving.

Response to Question 121:

The print out of the standard spec from the web is incorrect. Maximum slump is 2" for slip form paving.

Question 120:

General Note 3 on Bridge Plan S1-2 says "no slip-forming of barriers is permitted, unless noted otherwise." Are we to infer from the note on S1-49 to saw cut the control joints the same day that the concrete is poured, that it has been noted otherwise and that slip-forming the parapets is permitted?

Response to Question 120:

DelDOT has decided that slip forming will be permitted on this project. The plans will be updated accordingly by addendum.

Question 119:

Drawings S2-2, S3-2, S4-2 and S5-2 the General Notes on those drawings say "no slip-forming of barriers is permitted, unless otherwise approved" and that on Drawings S6-2 and S8-2 the General Notes say "no slip-forming of parapets is permitted".

Response to Question 119:

DelDOT has decided that slip forming will be permitted on this project. The plans will be updated accordingly in an addendum.

Question 118:

Please clarify where slip-forming of Barriers and Parapets is required or permitted and if permitted anywhere, whether cast-in-place forming will also be permitted.

Response to Question 118:

Slip-forming of barriers or parapets is not required at any location. CIP forming of parapets is permitted. This will be clarified in an addendum.

Question 117:

Please refer to Drawing S6-25 regarding Note 11, which requires anchorage of all-thread rebar to the end plates of the Cross Girder. Please provide a detail for such anchorage or guidance so the contractor knows what is expected.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 117:

Further guidance/details will be provided in a future addendum.

Question 116:

Please verify that the all-thread rebar is not to be post-tensioned.

Response to Question 116:

All thread rebar is not to be post-tensioned.

Question 115:

What is the strength and Class of the "concrete fill" shown on Drawing S6-25 to be placed inside the Cross Girder?

Response to Question 115:

6000 psi concrete (602785). The plans will be updated to clarify this by addendum.

Question 114:

Please refer to the call out on the left side of Section A-A on Drawing S6-25 which says "second concrete fill pour". I cannot find any details or references to a first pour; please direct me to the location and limits of the first pour.

Response to Question 114:

Disregard note referring to the second concrete fill pour. There is no second pour. The detail will be updated by addendum.

Question 113:

Please refer to Special Provisions Item 602786- Portland Cement Concrete Masonry, Substructure 8,000 PSI and clarify the inconsistencies between the Materials section which requires 8,000 PSI and the Method of Measurement and Basis of Payment, both of which reference a lesser 6,000 PSI strength.

Response to Question 113:

8,000 psi is correct. The special provision will be modified to reflect the correct strength by addendum.

Question 112:

Can plans be made available for the Christiana Mall Access Project so that we can determine where our scope of work ends and the work for the Mall Access Bridge begins?

Response to Question 112:

This has been provided in the Supplemental Bid Information document.

Question 111:

Are there any milestones for the Mall Access Bridge Contract that relate to traffic, project completion, or phase completion?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 111:

The intent is for work to be completed by ~~November 1, 2011~~ February 1, 2012.

Question 110:

On page 2 of the proposal under “Construction Phasing” it states that if the Contractor desires to revise the construction phasing it must submit an official revised construction phasing plan for the Department’s review no later than 42 calendar days prior to the bid opening. It was stated at the mandatory prebid that additional time was going to be allowed (approx additional week) for the submission of revised phasing. What is the exact date and time that the submission must be in DELDOT’s hands and what is the location it is to be submitted to. Is the submission suppose to be hard copy or electronic; please advise.

Response to Question 110:

Any revised construction phasing plans are to be received by Contract Administration for review no later than 4:30 P.M. local time, January 28, 2011. The due date is shown on the Bids.Delaware.gov website and was addressed at the pre-bid meeting. The physical address is 800 Bay Road, Dover, DE 19901 or mailing address is P.O. Box 778 Dover, DE 19903.

Question 109:

Please refer to Note 3 on Drawing S8-2 which makes reference to Item No. 602001 PPC Masonry, Abutment, Class A, however no such item exists in the Schedule of Items. Please clarify which item is to be used for this work.

Response to Question 109:

The concrete for the abutments is quantified under item 602717. Concrete shall be Class A, 4,500 psi. The General Notes will be updated by addendum (the quantities are accounted for).

Question 108:

Can the engineer provide top of grate elevations for the following inlets, 243, 245, 246, 247, 258, 262, 264, 267, and 351? If not can you direct us to which plan sheets would provide the necessary information?

Response to Question 108:

The plans will be updated by addendum to include the top of grate elevations for inlets 245, 246, 247, 258, 262, 264 and 267. Top of grate elevations for inlets 243 and 351 can be developed using the profile, typical sections and grades and geometrics sheets for Ramp B.

Question 107:

Would it be possible to have an index sheet to the cross section plans such as you have on the regular plan sheets?

Response to Question 107:

An index sheet for the cross sections will be provided.

Question 106:

Are any existing bridge plans available for the Mall Access Bridge to be removed and Bridge S-8 to be widened in this contract?

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 106:

This has been provided in the Supplemental Bid Information document.

Question 105:

This project contains over 11,000,000 lbs of structural steel and piling with a project duration of approx. 3 years. Due to the volatile nature of raw material markets, we respectfully request that the Department consider adding a means to compensate the contractor for an increase or provide a rebate to the Department for a decrease due to market fluctuations, similar to that used in other states.

Response to Question 105:

DelDOT is developing specification language to address this concern, which will be provided by addendum.

Question 104:

On Plan sheet S8-2 (Sheet No. 514), for Note #3 under the General Notes of Bridge S8 it states that the concrete for the abutments shall be under Item 602001, however, there is no Item 602001 listed in the Schedule of Prices. Is it DelDOT's intention for this concrete to be under Item 602015? Please clarify.

Response to Question 104:

The concrete for the abutments is quantified under item 602717. Concrete shall be Class A, 4,500 psi. The General Notes will be updated by addendum. (The quantities are accounted for.)

Question 103:

Special provisions page 42, section 2 Question and answers, third sentence states "Questions and Answers will be dated and posted periodically on DelDOT's Website located at:

<http://www.deldot.gov/public.ejs?command=PublicBusinessBidCal>." We cannot find the posting on the website. Should we be looking at another section of the website or is there no questions and answers posted to date?

Response to Question 103:

Questions and answers have been posted.

Question 102:

General Notices page 13 Critical DBE requirements, section 3 states "Bidder shall submit with their bid the name, address, age of the firm, and the gross annual receipts of each DBE and non-DBE subcontractor that supplied a quote or a bid to the prime on this project. The Department has attached this document following the Certification document at the end of the Proposal. Failure to submit this information will result in the bid being declared non-responsive and will be rejected." We cannot find this document following the Certification document. Please advise. Do you require the same information for DBE and non-DBE suppliers?

Response to Question 102:

Disregard paragraph 3 of the Critical DBE requirements referenced in Question 102. This is no longer required.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 101:

Is there an EBS file for addendum #1?

Response to Question 101:

There is not a separate EBS file for addendum 1.

Question 100:

For the Bid Bond, we wanted to clarify that the bid bond is based on the amount bid for part A and not the total for part A and B.

Response to Question 100:

That is correct. Refer to Special Provision 763564 - SPECIAL BIDDING PROCEDURE.

Question 99:

Regarding Pay Item 720512. The pay item is listed as "PCC Safety Barrier Permanent, **Double Face**", however on the plans it shows "PCC Safety Barrier Permanent, **Single Face**" with the same designated item number. Sheet 182 shows a detail with the item number 720512 and the detail is of a **single** faced barrier. In addition, the Typical Sections (Sheets 6-48) refer to the roadway item "T", which is also designated as item 720512 and listed as "PCC Safety Barrier Permanent, **Single Face**". The single face barrier appears to suit the Typical Sections. Should pay item 720512 be changed to PCC Safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face?

Response to Question 99:

The correct item for this work is 720529, PCC safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 98:

On Plan Sheet 704 of 803, Note 2 says, "Payment for High Mast Lighting Foundations shall be paid for under Item #746561, High Mast Lighting Pole and Foundation." There is no Item #746561 in the Bid Item List. How will the concrete for High Mast Pole Foundations be paid?

Response to Question 98:

Payment for High Mast Lighting Foundations shall be paid for under Item #602774, PCC Masonry for Light Pole Foundations. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 97:

The quantity for Item #602774 PCC Masonry for Light Pole Foundations seems too high. Can you provide a breakdown of where the quantity comes from? Does it include the quantity for the High Mast Pole Foundations?

Response to Question 97:

This item includes the quantity for the davit arm light pole foundations, high mast light pole foundations, and the median barrier mounted light foundations (along I-95).

Question 96:

In the Spec for Item #602773 - PCC Masonry for MSE Walls, it says, "This work shall consist of the construction of the C-I-P coping, moment slab, and barrier on the MSE Walls. However, Item #602017 -

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

PCC Masonry, Parapet, CI D includes the quantity of concrete for the moment slabs and barriers on the MSE Walls. Will the spec for Item #602773 be revised to include only the quantity for the copings?

Also the breakout sheets for this item should be revised. Item 1 Wall 2 is for Moment Slab & Parapet and should be eliminated. Items for the Copings for the MSE Walls at Bridges S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, and S6 should be added.

Response to Question 96:

The specification for Item 602733 will be updated by addendum to include only the coping concrete. Breakout sheet will be updated by addendum to remove Wall 2 concrete and to also include the walls at the bridges.

Question 95:

In the Spec for Item #623002 - Prestressed Reinforced Concrete Members, Box Beams, it Says, "Failure to submit the breakout sheet with the Bid Proposal will result in the Bid Proposal being declared non-responsive and rejected." No breakdown sheet was provided and will therefore need to be created.

Response to Question 95:

A breakout sheet for this item will not be required. The specification for this item will be updated by addendum.

Question 94:

Specification section 202505 on page 45, notes that the settlement platforms are to be paid for at the contract unit price per each. However, bid item 30, for settlement platforms, has a bid quantity of 18 lf. Please clarify.

Response to Question 94:

Item 202505 Settlement Platforms are paid at the Unit Price per Each. This will be corrected by addendum.

Question 93:

According to 605757 High Performance Steel, only fabricators that have been certified by AISC in "Major Steel Bridges (Cbr)" and having the "Fracture Critical Members Endorsement (F)", or approved equal, may be used to fabricate high performance steel conforming to AASHTO M270, Grade HPS70W. In addition, prior to fabrication, the contractor is to submit the results of the latest AISC certification review of the proposed fabricator to DeIDOT's representative to "determine if items critical to successful fabrication meet the needs of the specific work."

If after the contractor submits the results of the latest AISC certification review to DeIDOT of the proposed fabricator (who at that time holds a current AISC Cbr certification with F endorsement), and DeIDOT determines the fabricator is not satisfactory to meet the needs of the specific work for this project, how will DeIDOT compensate the contractor for having to use another fabricator, assuming there is an additional cost to do so?

Response to Question 93:

Anything a fabricator works on must be completed by that shop. If the Fabricator is not re-certified, then any new work would have to go to another certified shop and that would be at the Contractor's expense.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 92: cancelled

Question 91:

What are the criteria that DeIDOT will use in determining if the fabricator will be permitted to furnish items critical to successful fabrication meeting the needs of the specific work for this project?

Response to Question 91:

Criteria stated in the Spec.

Question 90:

In the second paragraph of Special Provision 605757, under Basis of Payment, there are two references to item 605001 however, no such bid item can be found; please clarify.

Response to Question 90:

Special Provision 605757 - Basis of payment should refer to 605002. The special provision will be updated by addendum.

Question 89:

On Bridge S8, SR1 over Eagle Run, Two runs of conduit are shown in the parapet sections. Please specify a size and type of material for these conduits. Please also provide details of potential tie-ins to other conduits or termination details for these conduits for future use.

Response to Question 89:

The conduit runs are 2" (power) and 3" (comm) The drawings will be updated to reflect this clarification and material type by addendum.

Question 88:

Bid Item 720534 is for the Furnishing of Portable Impact Attenuators. How will replacement parts and the labor and equipment required to install the replacement parts be paid to the contractor when the units are damaged by vehicle impacts?

New Response to Question 88:

A breakout sheet will be provided by addendum for Items 720532 and 720534, listing the different components of the attenuator. Repairs will be made at the unit price bid in the breakout sheets for the specific component that is repaired or replaced.

Breakout Sheets for items 720532 and 720534 were removed and replaced with "Forms" for both of these items, in Addendum 4.

Question 87:

Please clarify how the department intends to use the breakout sheets after award of the contract? Will the unit prices contained in the breakout sheets be use as the mechanism of payment for quantity overruns and deletions?

Response to Question 87:

Yes, the breakout sheets will be used to determine unit prices in the event of increased or decreased quantities shown on breakout sheets.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 86:

On sheet S6-23 are sections A and B on page S6-25?

Response to Question 86:

Yes, plans will be updated to clarify by addendum.

Question 85:

You show end plates but no section on how to weld?

Response to Question 85:

This will be addressed by addendum.

Question 84:

Side elevation of cross girder shows 4 stiffeners on each end what is a bearings stiffener, jacking or erection?

Response to Question 84:

The stiffeners are labeled incorrectly. They are bearing and jacking stiffener, no erection stiffener. The plans will be modified to clarify the label by addendum.

Question 83:

Where is section showing jacking and erection stiffeners?

Response to Question 83:

No erection stiffener needed. The jacking stiffener detail is the same as bearing stiffener. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 82:

On sheet S6-28 integral pier cap anchorage cover section is that for all girders or only for G1 and G4?

Response to Question 82:

Anchorage cover section is only for G1 and G4. We will clarify this issue by addendum.

Question 81:

On sheet S6-29 you show section A-A with no studs but shear studs section shows studs, do the studs go on all girders?

Response to Question 81:

Shear studs on all 4 girders both sides of web.

Question 80:

Sheet S6-31 and 32 do not have a chart with length dimensions for S1 thru S4

Response to Question 80:

The chart will be included by addendum.

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 79:

No bearing stiffener size per sheet 36

Response to Question 79:

Bearing stiffener is 1" x 8 1/2", the plans will be updated to reflect this by addendum.

Question 78:

Sheet S6-36 where do jacking stiffeners go?

Response to Question 78:

The stiffeners are to be located 1'-6" from centerline of bearing at each abutment on both sides of each girder. (16 total plates) Plate dimensions are 1" x 8 1/2" full depth of web. The plans will be modified to clarify the location by addendum.

Question 77:

Please refer to Section C-C on Drawing S1-37 which shows a bearing stiffener at Pier 1 and 3, but none is shown for these locations on Drawings S1-38 or S1-39 (only transverse stiffeners); are bearing stiffeners required?

Please refer to Girder Elevation on Drawing S1-38 and S1-39 which shows jacking stiffeners at the abutments, end view and Note 5 on Drawing S1-58 and Drawing S1-59 which indicate jacking is required at Piers 1, 2 & 3.

There are no bearing or jacking stiffeners shown for these locations; is it up to the contractor to decide if they are required? If so, are temporary stiffeners permitted?

Response to Question 77:

Bearing stiffeners are not required at the integral piers. The stiffeners shown on the bearing detail sheet no S1-37 will be deleted by addendum.

Jacking stiffeners are provided at the abutments for future maintenance of the bearings. The jacks will be placed against the integral pier caps for Piers 1 & 3, and therefore jacking stiffeners would not be required at the piers. We have performed an analysis of the girders to determine if bearing stiffeners are needed during construction and found that they are not required for the temporary steel erection loads and deck and pier cap concrete loads. However, the contractor is responsible for construction engineering and shall confirm that bearing stiffeners are not required for all temporary conditions during construction.

Question 76:

Several inconsistencies have been noticed in Standard Specification 602 as follows:

The third paragraph of 602.14a. where the English dimensions of 2 and 12" vs. the metric dimensions of (50 by 38 mm) for shear keys.

The second paragraph of 602.17a. where the English dimensions of 3" vs. the metric dimension of (6 mm) for the bush-hammering of bearings.

The third paragraph of 602.20a.1. where the English dimensions of 2" vs. the metric dimensions of (13 mm) for maximum deflection.

Two places in the second paragraph of 602.20c.1. where the English dimensions of 12" vs. the metric dimensions of (38 mm) for nominal centers and spacing of sawed grooves.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 76:

The dimensions should read:

602.14a	2 by 1 1/2" (50 by 38mm)
602.17a	1/4" (6mm)
602.20a.1	1/2" (13mm)
602.20c.1	1 1/2" (38mm)

Question 75:

Special Provision 601502 Temporary Protective Shield, states that the shield must be designed for 100 lb/sq. ft. live load and 60 mph wind load. Please verify that the wind load is to be used for a vertical shield and 100 lb/sq. ft. live load is to be used for horizontal shields.

Response to Question 75:

The contractor's engineer is responsible for interpreting code provisions, applying loads per standard engineering practice and submitting the design for review and approval.

Question 74:

Since the entire Mall Access Road Bridge structure is to be removed, please reconsider the requirement (no. 9) that the drilling of holes in the existing steel work, or welding thereto, will not be permitted.

New Response to Question 74:

Modification of Requirement No. 9 will be ~~modified~~ permitted to allow drilling of holes in the existing steel work and/or welding thereto for demolition purposes only, providing the contractor submits adequate engineering analysis and shop drawings, prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of Delaware, showing the stability of the structure throughout the construction activities. ~~The plans will be modified accordingly by addendum.~~ Otherwise, Requirement 9 will remain as stated in Special Provision 601502.

Question 73-1:

The Department's answer to Q&A #73 and to #75 (partial), states that "The contractor's engineer is responsible for interpreting code provisions, applying loads per standard engineering practice and submitting the design for review and approval".

1. Does this mean that we will not also be held to 100 lb/sq. ft. live load (presumably for a horizontal shield) and 60 mph wind load (presumably for a vertical shield) if our engineer designs for different live and wind loads?
2. If the answer to #1 above is that we will also be held to these loadings, we need to know which of these loadings apply to a horizontal shield and which apply to a vertical shield. Please clarify this requirement.

Response to Question 73-1:

For the temporary shield(s) the contractor and their structural engineer need to determine the appropriate design for the contractor's means and methods of construction. The contractor's engineer is responsible for; interpreting code provisions; applying loads per standard engineering practice; compliance with the project's specifications and special provisions; and submitting the design to the Department for review and approval. Your structural engineer should be able to address these items.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 73:

Please verify that the 100 lb/sq. ft. live load design requirement is in accordance with OSHA's 4:1 strength requirement and OSHA's interpretation that "Temporary Catch Platforms" shall comply with the applicable 1926 CFR Subpart L requirements for scaffolding (see attached.)

Response to Question 73:

The requirements of the Temporary Protective Shield Special Provision do not relieve the contractor of providing a system that in accordance with OSHA. The contractor's engineer is responsible for interpreting code provisions, applying loads per standard engineering practice and submitting the design for review and approval.

Question 72:

We renew our request for the Department to consider accepting bids without the breakout sheets and permit the apparent low bidder to submit that information within 10 days after notification similar to the way the DBE paperwork, etc is handled. This would eliminate problems that could result from last minute changes that could cause mistakes. If this is not acceptable for all the breakout sheets, please consider it for sheets 2, 5, 6, 7, & 13 (steel, MSE, & sign supports). These are the most problematic.

Response to Question 72:

The Department will not consider accepting bids without the breakout sheets. The breakout sheets provide a benefit to the Department and are a required part of the submitted bid.

Question 71:

Along with the diesel and A/C cost adjustments, would the Department consider a steel cost adjustment (based on an index price) be added to the contract? The steel mills are already starting to apply surcharges and the steel suppliers will not quote firm prices (final price to be determined at time of delivery). This will minimize any guessing required on the bidders part in trying to determine what the final price will be.

Response to Question 71:

DelDOT is developing a steel price adjustment item for this project and it will be included by addendum.

Question 70:

Section 623002 indicates there is supposed to be a breakout sheet. There is no breakout sheet in the documents. Please advise.

Response to Question 70:

A breakout sheet for this item will not be required. The specification for this item will be updated by addendum.

Question 69:

The breakout sheet for Item 602787 indicates Bridge S3 has 3 post tensioned caps when it only has 1 cap. Please advise.

Response to Question 69:

The correct quantity is 1. The breakout sheet will be updated by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 68:

Plan sheet 704 of 803, Note 2 references Item 746561 which does not exist. Should this refer to Item 746621?

Response to Question 68:

Payment for High Mast Lighting Foundations shall be paid for under Item #602774, PCC Masonry for Light Pole Foundations. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 67:

The MSE retaining wall drawings refer to an architectural finish but I cannot find any reference to what that finish is supposed to be. Please advise.

Response to Question 67:

This issue will be addressed by addendum.

Question 66:

Item 720512 indicates it is a double face barrier. The detail on plan sheet 182 under that item number depicts a single face barrier. Will Item 720512 be used to compensate for the single face barrier shown on sheet 182?

Response to Question 66:

The correct item for this work is 720529, PCC safety Barrier Permanent, Single Face. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 65:

Barrier control joints are shown on the bridge drawings to be saw cut for S1, S2, S3, S4 & S5. Note 4 on Bridge Drawing S1-49 for example, says to saw cut control joint the same day that concrete is poured. Such a note infers that the barrier MUST be slip formed. If slip forming is the only acceptable means of casting the barrier on these five structures, please advise and provide any necessary specifications which we will be expected to follow.

Response to Question 65:

Slip-forming of barriers or parapets is not required at any location. CIP forming of parapets is permitted. This will be clarified by addendum.

Question 64:

Please provide the spacing of the contraction joints for Bridge S6, as is referenced by cross reference note 2 on Drawing S6-47 and include the spacing of the joints for the MSE wingwalls.

Response to Question 64:

Joint spacing is provided on sheet 448. A callout to the dimensions will be provided to clarify the joint spacing by addendum.

Question 63:

Contraction joints in the barriers and copings are noted to be installed on Retaining Wall Nos. 1 thru 16, but no spacing is shown and only the number of joints can be found on R5 thru R16. Please provide the spacing or number of joints for R1 thru R4.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response to Question 63:

This will be addressed by addendum.

Question 62:

Since the Retaining Wall barriers, Bridge S6 and Bridge S8 barriers are shown as having contraction joints, are we to assume that slip forming of these barriers is not allowed?

Response to Question 62:

DelDOT has decided that slip forming will be permitted on this project. The plans will be updated accordingly by addendum.

Question 61:

Please refer to the first paragraph of Standard Specification 602.08 and note that the English dimensions of 3" and 2" and the metric dimensions of (6 mm) and (13 mm) respectively are not equivalent. Please advise as to which of the two, English or Metric, the contractor will be held to.

Response to Question 61:

The dimensions should read 1/4" (6mm) and 1/2" (13mm).

Question 60:

Road User Costs of \$35,000.00/ calendar day for failure to open the project to unrestricted highway traffic on time, have been established for this project as indicated by the Prospective Bidders Note 7. There is no mention of any incentive payment to the contractor for opening the project to unrestricted highway traffic ahead of time. Would DelDOT consider paying such an incentive, provided the contractor is able to beat its own schedule?

Response to Question 60:

There are no additional monetary incentives in this A + B Project. The best possible completion time should be bid by the contractor.

Question 59:

Please refer to Bridge Drawing S1-18, where in the end view, the width of the integral cap is shown to be 6'-0" as compared to Drawing S1-25, where Section A-A shows the width to be 6'-3"; please advise which is correct.

Response to Question 59:

6'-3" is the correct dimension. The plans will be updated by addendum.

Question 58:

In the Sequence of Construction which is shown for several of the bridges on this project, (i.e. see S1-20) sequence number 10 says to remove temporary shoring and grout ducts. Please verify that the grouting of the ducts is not required and that the grout is not required to obtain any specific strength, prior to removal of the temporary shoring.

Response to Question 58:

The tendons do not need to be grouted prior to removing the temporary shoring; however, the tendons do need to be grouted within the time limits indicated in the special provisions. If the

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

tendons are grouted prior to removing the temporary shoring, the grout shall achieve a minimum compressive strength of 3,000 psi before the temporary shoring is removed. The special provisions will be updated by addendum to reflect the requirements.

Question 57-1:

Question #57 referred to a note under "Note to Contractor" in the "Suggested Erection Sequence" for structures S1 @ Piers #1, #2, & #3 (S1-57) and S4 @ Pier #1 (S4-44) that required temporary bracing between the girders at each integral pier cap during superstructure erection and placement of concrete. Structure S6 also has two integral pier caps at Piers #1 & #3 but no such note exists that we could see. Our question was asked because we are not 100% sure what we are to design for as we are not privy to the designer's calculations. For example should the new diaphragms be considered to provide any resistance in the temporary bracing design and if so how much? Is temporary bracing required at S6? We are simply trying to ascertain what it is that the Department expects the contractor to design for.

Response to Question 57-1:

The following note was added to Sheet 504 (S6) in Addendum 4, "Provide temporary bracing between the girders in the vicinity of each integral pier cap during superstructure erection and placement of concrete. The temporary bracing shall be removed after the integral pier cap bracing is placed and prior to post-tensioning the integral cap."

The contractor is required to provide adequate bracing to ensure the bridge remains stable during erection and placement of concrete which is a requirement in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Construction Manual. The reason why we are advising this is because during construction the unbraced length of the compression flange is greater than 25 feet at the integral piers. Once the integral pier is constructed it is no longer an issue.

Question 57:

In accordance with the suggested erection sequence notes for several of the bridges on this project, (i.e. see S1-57) temporary bracing between the girders in the vicinity of each integral pier cap during superstructure erection and placement of concrete is required. Please provide sufficient information as to the magnitude and direction of any loading that the temporary bracing is expected to resist.

Response to Question 57:

The contractor is responsible for construction engineering. Temporary bracing shall be designed by a professional engineer registered in the state of Delaware as needed for the contractor's proposed erection plan. The provisions for erection are included in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Construction Specifications 11.6

Question 56:

Please verify that loads from the Temporary Shoring which are to support the weight of the girders, deck and integral pier caps, and which is shown as being supported by the pier footings for several bridges on this project, has been taken into consideration during the design of the footings and that as such, no analysis of these loads on the footing is required by the contractor

Response to Question 56:

The footings are designed to withstand the loads indicated on the plans. It is the responsibility of the contractor to verify that the proposed shoring system and erection scheme will not cause an overstress condition. The shoring system depicted in the plans is schematic, the actual shoring system and erection scheme are to be designed by the contractor.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 55:

Please advise as to any portions of the existing Mall Access Road Bridge that may remain below the ground surface, particularly any existing piling that may be present.

Response to Question 55:

The existing bridge is to be removed to the limits described in standard specification 211 or to a depth of 3' below proposed grade whichever is greater. The plans will be updated by addendum to clarify this issue.

Question 54:

Please provide plans of the existing Mall Access Road Bridge which is to be removed under Item 211000 Removal of Structures and Obstructions.

Response to Question 54:

This has been provided in the Supplemental Bid Information document.

Question 53:

Item # 720612 Impact Attenuator special is requiring an Energy Absorption Quad Guard LMC 90" No other systems shall be accepted. According to the manufacturer this system is for use in high impact locations. Since the applications are mostly new construction and there is not a need for a high impact type attenuator I ask the state to consider attenuators that will perform within the crash criteria of NCHRP 350 and be more appropriate for the design of the roadway. Attached are the acceptance letter and product sheet for an alternative Attenuator that meets all the NCHRP 350 criteria and can be repaired on site. The Attenuators proposed are being used on the new toll plaza on I-95.

Response to Question 53:

The specification is revised in Addendum 3.

Question 52:

Do ATSSA & DNREC Certifications have to be submitted with the bids or by low bidder 10 days after bid?

Response to Question 52:

ATSSA and DNREC Certifications must be submitted by the apparent low bidder within ten (10) calendar days after the bid opening.

Question 51:

In regards to the MSE Wall panels architectural finish the plans state, "The MSE panels shall receive an architectural finish." I have looked through the specs and they state a very similar comment. Is there a particular finish that is going to be required for this project, or are we to assume it is a smooth form finish? We are manufacturers of the Tricon Retained Soil System and are looking to bid this project.

Response to Question 51:

More clarification will be provided for finishes on the retaining walls in an upcoming addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 50:

How do you become a Certified Construction Reviewer for DNREC? Is there a course? And when and where is the course offered?

Response to Question 50:

This information is available from DNREC by telephone at 302-739-9921, or, on their Webpage at this link: <http://www.swc.dnrec.delaware.gov/Pages/SedimentStormwater.aspx>

Question 49-1:

It is our opinion that the response to Q&A #49 does not accurately answer the 3 questions that were asked therein (see below) and we respectfully request that the questions and response be re-reviewed and that further clarification be provided.

Response to Question 49-1:

~~The Bid Proposal Form page 32 will be modified in Addendum 4 to remove the entry for the proposed amount of Weather Days. The bidder can include any amount of Weather Days in their calculation of *Total number of calendar days (including Weather Days)*. Prior to construction, the total number of weather days will be determined by the Table shown in the Special Bidding Procedure. The Department will monitor the number of Weather Days that affect the Critical Path of the Schedule from the first day of work until the project is substantially completed. If the actual weather days exceed those originally determined in the Table, the contractor receives a non-compensable time extension for the number of days in excess.~~

New Response to Question 49-1:

Refer to the Response to Question A3Q20.

Question 49:

How will the total number of adverse weather days, which is to be determined by each bidder and entered on Page 32 of the Bid Proposal Form (Special Bidding Procedure T200809003.01), be used by DelDOT in determining if a time extension is warranted? How will this figure be used (if at all) in determining the low bidder? What affect does the difference between the number of adverse weather days shown in Table 1 on Page 338 of the Proposal and the value which is to be entered on Page 32 of the Bid Proposal Form have on determining if the Contractor is entitled to a time extension?

Response to Question 49:

We have not added any more weather days when time extensions are approved for the job. We just continue to monitor those extended days against the originally established days for the original duration. If it exceeds the amount originally advertised, they recover one for one after that.

Question 48:

Please verify that the pay limits for PCC Pavement and Bridge Approach Slab Pavement in the areas of MSE Walls will be to the outside face of the Parapet.

Response to Question 48:

The pay limits are to the outside face of the parapet/barrier.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 47:

We request a breakdown (for information only) be provided by structure, for at least the Bridge Quantity Pay Items.

New Response to Question 47:

Breakout of Bridge items for information only will be provided by addendum.

A breakout of the bridge items is available as Supplemental Bid Information at: <http://www.bids.delaware.gov/>. Note these are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Contract Documents.

Question 46:

On Sheet # 519, Bridge # 331N. Cannot find the details for the (2 ea.) elastomeric bearing pads used on the abutments.

Response to Question 46:

The bearing pads for Abutment 1 & 2 are the same specified for Bent 2 as shown on sheet 519. Plan will be updated by addendum. However, the quantity is correct.

Question 45:

Please clarify as to whether or not slipforming of bridge parapets will be allowed. Structure notes state “no slipforming of barriers is permitted, unless otherwise approved.” However notes regarding parapet construction require that control joints be sawcut the same day that concrete is poured, a procedure normally used for slipformed parapets.

Response to Question 45:

DelDOT has decided that slip forming will be permitted on this project. The plans will be updated accordingly by addendum.

Question 44:

Please clarify under which bid item the moment slabs for Retaining Walls 2, 7 & 10 are to be paid? It appears that these are included in Item 602017, PCC Masonry, parapet, Class A

Response to Question 44:

The concrete for the moment slabs for Walls 2, 7 and 10 are paid for under Item 602017, PCC Masonry, parapet, Class A. The reinforcing steel is paid for under Item 604000, Bar Reinforcement, Epoxy Coated.

Question 43:

Please specify what structural rebar is to be paid for under Items 60300 and 60400, i.e. what rebar is incidental to other items and is NOT paid under 60300 and 60400.

Response to Question 43:

All reinforcing is to be paid for under 603000 and 604000 as indicated in bar schedules, unless indicated otherwise by Special Provision or plan note where they are incidental to the item.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 42:

General notes on each of the bridge plans state “Sheeting and Shoring shall be required for any excavation exceeding 5 feet in height, the cost shall be paid under Item No. 207501 – in lieu of shoring, the contractor may use a 2:1 cut slope. Why is a 2:1 slope required?”

Response to Question 42:

This will be addressed by addendum.

Question 41:

Please specify the method of measurement used to calculate the SF areas tabulated in Breakout Sheet 1 for Item 207501-Sheeting and Shoring.

Response to Question 41:

This will be addressed by addendum.

Question 40:

Bid Item 605658 Strip Seal Expansion Joint, 2” appears to be for Bridge S-8. Note 1 on plan sheet S8-16 states that the strip seals are to be paid for under strip seal expansion joints, 3”. Please clarify the joint size for Bridge S-8 and under which item it is to be paid.

Response to Question 40:

The Strip Seal Expansion Joint for Bridge S-8 is a 2” joint. The plans will be updated by addendum to reflect this update.

Question 39:

Please clarify under which bid item the concrete for the MSE bridge abutment copings is to be paid.

Response to Question 39:

The coping concrete is paid for under 602773. Breakout sheet 3 and plan sheets were updated in addendum 2 and 3.

Question 38:

Page 90 of the Special Provisions contains several bid items (602718-602723) that are not in the Schedule of Items. Please clarify whether these items pertain to this project, and if so, please add to the Schedule of Items and provide details of the proposed work.

Response to Question 38:

Bid items (602718-602723) do not pertain to this project.

Question 37:

Special Provision 602779 – POST-TENSIONING GROUT, state that payment for this work will be incidental to the lump sum price of the pertinent cubic yard concrete item. Please clarify if DELDOT’s intention for this work is to actually be incidental to the “Post-Tensioned Pier Cap Bonded System” and not the pertinent concrete item. Please advise.

Response to Question 37:

Special Provision 602779 will be updated by addendum to clarify the intention of the work.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 36:

15 Bid Item Breakout Sheets. The bid proposal includes fifteen(15) breakout sheets which must be included with the bid. We respectfully request that the Department consider allowing the low bidder to submit these breakout sheets within a reasonable time after the bid (5 – 10 days). Material and subcontractor quotations that are part of the breakdowns (e.g. structural steel) are likely to change within a short time prior to bid making it virtually impossible to accurately change the sheets accordingly. Please consider the above request.

Response to Question 36:

The Department will not consider accepting bids without the breakout sheets. The breakout sheets provide a benefit to the Department and are a required part of the submitted bid.

Question 35:

Would it be possible to simply include the items that are part of the breakout sheets as bid items in the EBS file. The extra step of dealing with so many breakout sheets at bid time on a project of this size makes it much more difficult to accurately get the bid documents that must turned put together.

Response to Question 35:

The Department will not change breakout sheet items to regular bid items.

Question 34:

Please reference the Retaining Wall Plans (sheets 533-623). The general notes for each retaining wall indicate that the walls shall receive an architectural finish. Can you be more specific about the pattern or finish that you are expecting?

Response to Question 34

More clarification will be provided for finishes on the retaining walls by addendum.

Question 33:

On sheet 4 of the drawings, #7 of the General Notes lists the types of electronic files available to the contractor. The note says that “RASTER FILES, IN .CAL FILE FORMAT, FOR ALL PLAN SHEETS.”, will be made available to the contractor. Is the department going to make these files available during the bidding phase of this project? If yes, where can these files be found?

Response to Question 33:

These files are intended to be made available to the awarded contractor.

Question 32:

On sheet 4 of the drawings, #7 of the General Notes lists the types of electronic files available to the contractor. The note states that ASCII Data and .CAL files will be made available to the contractor. However it does not say that the existing or proposed Digital Terrain Model (.DTM) or the Design File (.DGN) will be made available. Is there any possibility of getting the .DTM or.DGN files that are listed as options in this note to help ensure the most accurate and competitive pricing for this project?

Response to Question 32:

SR 1/195 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The geotechnical reports, Microstation Design Files, and the Traffic Management Plan are available as Supplemental Bid Information at: <http://www.bids.delaware.gov/>.

Question 31:

On sheet(s) 7, 14, and 43 of the drawings pay item 755000, Hot-Mix, Hot Laid Bituminous Concrete Curb is called for. However item 755000 is not on the list of pay items for this project. Where should the contractor include the price for this work?

Response to Question 31:

This item will be addressed by addendum.

Question 30:

On sheet 537, the backfill for the lower portion of Retaining Wall 2 is called out to be a LWEF soil type. However there is no specification for this type of material. Can the DDOT provide the required specifications for this LWEF material?

Response to Question 30:

LWEF should be Controlled Low Strength Material (CLSM). The drawing will be updated and included by addendum.

Question 29:

On the sheets 533 thru 623, the typical section for retaining walls with PCC pavement Roadways shows a distance of 1'-6" from the flow line to the bottom of the coping. However the plan and elevation sheets of these walls call out a distance of 2'-6" from the flow line elevation to the bottom of the coping. Can the DDOT confirm that the correct measurement from the flow line elevation to the bottom of the coping is 1'-6" or offer an explanation of what the 2'-6" measurement represents?

Response to Question 29:

The correct distance from the flow line to the bottom of the coping is 2'-6". The detail will be updated and included in the Addendum.

Question 28:

Retaining Walls #1 thru #3 do not list the schedule of pay items to use. Should the contractor use the pay items listed on sheet 546 for retaining wall #4? Specifically, should all the contractor use pay item 604000 for the bar reinforcements listed on sheet 539 for retaining wall #2?

Response to Question 28:

The plans will be updated to include the pay items and will be included in the Addendum. Pay Item 604000 is the pay item for the bar reinforcement listed on sheet 539.

Question 27:

On sheet 619, the fill material in the "wedge" is not specified. The note says to see the foundation notes but the material type is not specified in these notes. Should it be assumed that this material is similar to the select fill material found in other walls?

Response to Question 27:

The material type for the wedge will be addressed and the drawing updated by addendum.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions 26:

For Bridges S1 thru S5 the abutment MSE wall minimum strap zone is shown along with the type of material to use. For Bridge S6, this information is not shown following the MSE plans for this bridge. Can this be clarified?

Response to Question 26:

The information will be included by addendum.

Question 25:

Copy of the TMP

Response to Question 25:

The geotechnical reports, Microstation Design Files, and the Traffic Management Plan are available as Supplemental Bid Information at: <http://www.bids.delaware.gov/>.

Question 24:

Would DelDOT be willing to share the .dgn files so the teams can sketch up their alternatives?

Response to Question 24:

The geotechnical reports, Microstation Design Files, and the Traffic Management Plan are available as Supplemental Bid Information at: <http://www.bids.delaware.gov/>.

Question 23:

What criteria would be looked at for approval of alternative phasing plans? Would it just be the ability to meet the criteria in the spec and as listed on page 638?

Response to Question 23:

This was discussed at the pre-bid meeting.

Question 22:

Can we get a set of drawings on CD in a dgn format? We are working on the MOT and it would be helpful to have the dgn files to provide DelDOT with our ideas.

Response to Question 22:

The geotechnical reports, Microstation Design Files, and the Traffic Management Plan are available as Supplemental Bid Information at: <http://www.bids.delaware.gov/>.

Question 21:

Ref note on plan sheets 624 and 625 for SWM 533 and 534 indicate this work to be completed by others. Does that mean there are constructed as shown on plan sheet 624 and 625? Other than sediment removal and repairing washouts what work will be required to convert to permanent ponds?

Response to Question 21:

SWM Facilities 533 and 534 will be constructed under contract T201009004. At the end of that contract these facilities will be left as sediment basins for use in Contract T200809003. At the end of T200809003 the contract will clean the basins of all sediment, repair any washouts (and any disturbances caused by these efforts) and seed bare areas in accordance with the notes on plan

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

sheets 624 & 625. The contractor will also be responsible for the removal of the skimmer device that was constructed under T201009004.

Question 20:

How does DelDOT arrive at the bid quantity for item 743504? Some of the required signs are shown on plan sheet 635. On detour plan sheets 674 thru 679a note on some drawings indicate these signs are installed by contractor for Contract T201009004 (to be left in place by that contractor and become the property of this contractor. Please clarify.

Response to Question 20:

The 743504 signs are all each items, hence you only need to count the sign symbols shown on the plan. The signs from the previous contract (T201009004) were not included under 743504. Payment to adjust, relocate, and remove the signs from the previous contract are paid for under 763500 MOT as noted on the Detour Plans.

Question 19:

Can you provide more specific details of the new 12" tie-ins to the existing 12" dip?

Response to Question 19:

This will be addressed by addendum.

Question 18:

What is the detail of the carrier pipe inside casing (what will be required casing spacers, wood skids, any fill material)?

Response to Question 18:

The 12" casing is for future use and is currently empty.

Question 17:

Is this a bore or open cut installation?

Response to Question 17:

It is anticipated that Artesian will extend the 12" steel casing pipe via open cut.

Question 16:

What is the spec on the 12" dip and 20" casing (class of dip and wall thickness of casing pipe)?

Response to Question 16:

The 20" casing will be installed by Artesian as it is part of the water line relocation. Class of DIP and Wall thickness of the 12" casing pipe will be addressed by addendum.

Question 15:

If this is an Artesian line will they be supplying the new water main materials?

Response to Question 15:

See response to Question 14.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 14:

Is this line the City of Wilmington or Artesian Water Co? The specs say City of Wilmington.

Response to Question 14:

The water line is owned by Artesian. Since the time of advertisement it has been decided that Artesian will relocate the water line. Item 614508 will be removed from the contract by addendum.

Question 13:

Why are there no storm drain profiles shown on the plans?

Response to Question 13:

In accordance with DeIDOT criteria, storm drain profiles are not required.

Question 12:

Ref note 35 on plan sheet 5, what are the quantities of stockpiled materials contained in areas A, B, and C (breakdown by area)?

Response to Question 12:

Estimated quantities are as follows: Area A & B (combined) = 48,000 CY +/-, Area C = 30,000 CY +/-.

Question 11:

Are the bid quantities correct for items 612021, 612022, 612023, and 612025?

Response to Question 11:

The bid quantities for each of these items is incorrect and will be revised by addendum.

Question 10:

There are only 4 runs on 18" RCP CL V, all shown on plan sheet 143, so how do you arrive at your quantity of 562 LF shown on the bid proposal?

Response to Question 10:

The quantity is incorrect and will be revised by addendum.

Question 9:

What does DI-250 shown on plan sheet 142 outlet to?

Response to Question 9:

DI-250 outlets to the existing 18" RCP.

Question 8:

What is the size of pipe that DI-243 and DI-239 sit over?

Response to Question 8:

DI-243 and DI-239 sit over an existing 24" CCP which is inside of a 30" steel casing pipe.

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 7:

On plan sheet 142 what does pipe 239 connect to (size and type of pipe)?

Response to Question 7:

P-239 ties to an existing 24" CCP which is inside of a 30" steel casing pipe.

Question 6:

Is the size of DI-108 at 34" x 24" correct with 30" RCP going in and out of inlet?

Response to Question 6:

The inlet size is incorrect and will be revised by addendum.

Question 5:

Why is the quantity for bid item 612529 only 568 lf with all the pipework being done on this contract?

Response to Question 5:

The revised quantity has been included in Addendum 2. Project Note 10 states: "video inspection for new pipes will be paid under item 612529"

Question 4:

Item 743007 traffic officers does not have the fixed price shown on the pricing proposal in the specs however it is shown on the bid disk as \$75.00 per hour

Response to Question 4:

This has been corrected.

Question 3:

Why is a breakout sheet required for bid item 614508 when there is only one item shown on breakout sheet?

Response to Question 3:

This item was removed with Addendum 2. Artesian forces will perform the water line relocation. An updated Utility Statement will be included in a future Addendum.

Question 2:

I am emailing to request a copy of the geotechnical report for the above mentioned job. We use this report assist us in preparing our bid for the job.

Response to Question 2:

The geotechnical reports, Microstation Design Files, and the Traffic Management Plan are available as Supplemental Bid Information at: <http://www.bids.delaware.gov/>.

Question 1:

Due to the complexity of the bid, the large number of breakout sheets, and the large number of items within the breakout sheets, would the Department consider accepting bids without the breakout sheets (just the lump sum line items) and permit the apparent low bidder to submit that information (the breakout sheets supporting the lump sum prices) within 10 days after notification (like the DBE paperwork)? This

SR 1/I95 INTERCHANGE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

would eliminate problems that could result from last minute changes, etc that could cause mistakes. By requiring the information to be submitted within 10 days and prior to award, the Department does not lose anything.

Response to Question 1:

The Department will not consider accepting bids without the breakout sheets. The breakout sheets provide a benefit to the Department and are a required part of the submitted bid.