

Pre-Bid Questions

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Last Updated: | 2/4/2021 |
| Project: | STP 2021(351) |
| Control: | 2850-01-018 |
| Highway: | FM 2821 |
| Let Date: | February 2021 |
| From: | At Rosenwall Road |
| To: | |
| County: | Walker |
| District: | Bryan |
| Addenda: | None |

Question 1:

What are the proposed wingwall dimensions? It appears that the normally included Box Culvert Supplemental Details for Wingwalls was not included.

Response 1:

You are correct, the BCS sheet was not included, the dimensions for the wing walls will be:
Station 152+91 (Both), 1-10'x10', 4 FT Max Fill Height, SCP-10, FW-0, Skew Angle = 0°, 2:1 Side Slope, T = 10 IN, U = 10 IN, C = 0.5 FT, Hw = 11.0833 FT, A = 21.5 FT, B = 12.413 FT, Lw = 24.826 FT, Ltw = N/A, Atw = N/A

Question 2:

Can any additional information be provided for the concrete and asphalt driveways (Ex. Depths, materials, rebar, etc.)?

Response 2:

Concrete: match existing depth with a minimum depth of 4" and #4 rebar on 12" centers
Asphalt: 4" of SP-D with 8" of subsidiary base.

Question 3:

Will TxDOT allow the use of F-Shape Barrier with appropriate crash attenuators in lieu of the low profile CTB?

Response 3:

No.

Question 4:

The proposed typical section shows an AE-P underseal across the existing road. Should this have been the RC-250?

Response 4:

Bid as shown.

Question 5:

The existing pavement shows to have quite a bit of hot mix. Shouldn't an AC-15P or CRS-2P be better than an RC-250 underseal prior to an overlay?

Response 5:

The existing bid item is for AE-P, bid as shown.

Question 6:

There are no bid items for remove concrete or asphalt driveways, is this work subsidiary to other items?

Response 6:

Bid as shown, you are correct, the plans do not have an item for removal of driveways. This is a minor plan error. Do not make driveway removal work subsidiary to other items. Any quantity or item errors will be adjusted under the contract provisions of Item 4.4 after letting and award of the contract.

Question 7:

Per sheet 14- TCP Narrative- Phase 1 shows to consist of widening on both sides of FM 2821 with Low Profile CTB on both sides of the roadway. Is it the intent to set barrier on both sides of the road and build simultaneously during phase 1?

Response 7:

Yes, the intent is to build both sides at the same time to reduce the number of crew mobilizations required by the contractor.

Question 8:

The plans show Drill Seed on the E&Q sheet and Quantity Summary Sheets, but the SW3P layout shows Cellulose fiber mulch. Which is correct?

Response 8:

Bid as shown in the E&Q and Quantity Summary, the cellulose fiber mulch callout on the SW3P layouts is a minor plan error.

Question 9:

The plans show item 432-6017 RIPRAP (STONE TY R)(DRY)(18 IN) on the E&Q sheet and Quantity Summary Sheets, but the SW3P layout shows RIPRAP (STONE TY R)(GROUT)(18 IN). Which is correct?

Response 9:

Bid as shown in the E&Q and Quantity Summary, the GROUT callout on the SW3P layouts is a minor plan error.

Question 10:

The plans show item 432-6017 RIPRAP (STONE TY R)(DRY)(18 IN) on the E&Q sheet and Quantity Summary Sheets, but the SW3P layout shows RIPRAP (STONE TY R)(GROUT)(18 IN). Which is correct?

Response 10:

Bid as shown in the E&Q and Quantity Summary, the GROUT callout on the SW3P layouts is a minor plan error.

Question 11:

The plans show item 432-6017 RIPRAP (STONE TY R)(DRY)(18 IN) on the E&Q sheet and Quantity Summary Sheets, but the SW3P layout shows RIPRAP (STONE TY R)(GROUT)(18 IN). Which is correct?

Response 11:

Bid as shown in the E&Q and Quantity Summary, the GROUT callout on the SW3P layouts is a minor plan error.

Question 12:

Is there a pavement profile included for line item 530-6005(Diveways (ACP))?

Response 12:

See sheet 58.

Question 13:

Is there Cross section information for the project?

Response 13:

See the FTP site.