**Surf Rd. NRCS Drainage Improvements**

**Questions & Answers – FINAL LIST**

**ITB #2014-03**

Q. What is the budget amount for this project?

***A. $200,000.***

Q. Table of Contents page indicates that a soils report is attached to the bid documents but I cannot locate one. Can you please send the report?

***A. The Geotechnical Report will be included in a forthcoming addendum.***

Q. Plan Pg. S7 – Sheet Pile Coating Plan:  This plan sheet indicates coating but does not indicate the product required. I cannot find the specification for the coating in the bid documents.  Can you supply the specification for the coating?

***A. The coating is required to be 12-14 mil of epoxy coal tar or poly-urea as manufacutured by Krylon or Rust-o-leum. Touch up or field applied coating is required to be 2-10 mil coats of the specified coating.***

1. Guardrail – please advise of the offset from centerline between the section on the concrete and that abutting the sheet pile wall.
2. ***Guardrail shall be placed in accordance with FDOT specifications as shown, a minimum of 10’ from the edge of travel lane.***
3. What are the min and max flows in CFS/GPM of the creek.
4. ***Flow rates are not available. The minimum and maximum elevations vary seasonally from -2 to 7.5.***
5. Sheet S2 - shows CZ 72 sheeting while sheets S-4 and S-5 show CZ67.  Which is correct?
6. ***CZ 67 is the required sheet pile. Please see the revised plans.***

Q. Sheet S-4 – The tie to the whaler along the 12’-7” section of sheet next to the existing box culvert.  Shouldn’t this be continuous to keep the sheets straight?

***A. The 12’-7” section in question is supported at the top by the pre-cast concrete deck and does not require a waler or tie back system.***

1. Sheet S-3 – Section A-A shows an HP 12x63 cap while B-B shows an HP 10x57.  Please advise which is correct.

***A. The proposed pile cap is required to be HP 10x57. Please see the revised plans.***

1. Sheet S-2/S-3- It appears that a beam is necessary to span both the left and right 34 foot section s of piles under the parapet wall.  This is for both the vertical and battered piles. Which beam size is appropriate?  This would constitute approximately 136 additional feet of cap.
2. ***There are no s-piles proposed under the parapet wall.***
3. Sheet S-5 – shows a WT 15x58 whaler, Sheet S-6 shows a C7x9.8 Channel, is one or the other or both required?
4. ***The proposed waler is required to WT 15x58. Please see the revised plans.***
5. S-6 – 3”x5”x3 ¼” Plate – is this continuous for the length of the C channel assuming the above or not necessary with a T plate WT 15x58?
6. ***The proposed waler is a WT 15x58, therefore this is not applicable.***
7. How is the 600 LF of pile accounted for and how long do they need to be?.  There appears to be 28 piles, 18 vertical, 10 battered.
8. ***The project consists of 4 vertical piles, 4 battered piles, plus 4 pile caps. Please see Sheet C4.***
9. Sheet S-2; S-3; S-4 – Requirement of 88 KIP on the Helical Anchors has to be achieved in 20 feet or the opposing anchors will hit each other or penetrate the others zone of influence.  Please advise as this seems very short for the resistance required.
10. ***As an option, the contractor may choose to bore a solid rod under the roadway that can be connected to the wall/waler on the opposing side of the roadway. Minimum working loads as shown are required to be met.***
11. What is the load bearing of the piles and the driving depth?
12. ***The existing soils data suggests that a 70’ pile length will suffice. A test pile will be required (see revised structural notes). Pile capacity is 15 tons axial service load, 30 ton ultimate capacity.***