

**CSJ 1068-01-228**  
**IH-30**  
**Tarrant County**  
**June 30, 2020**

**Contractor # 1**

Q1. We are preparing our bid for the referenced project and request that you please populate the FTP with any and all cross sections, pavement design reports, earthwork files, digital earthwork data (\*.XSR format, if possible), geotechnical reports, global stability analysis, time calculation data, detour cross sections, ROW Maps, and other files/data you may have available to assist in our preparation of a proposal for this project as soon as possible.

**A1. ROW from ROWIS are provided in FTP site. Most of the information requested will not be available. Site visit might be performed by contractor on their own expenses.**

**Contractor # 2**

Q2. Typical Section Sheet 3 shows a couple of elements that are confusing from a scope of work standpoint:

- Existing Typical shows the flume frontslope to be existing at 6:1 TYP. The Proposed Typical shows the frontslope at 3:1 typical post construction. Are we removing and replacing any of that flume? Are we regrading that area to 3:1 from a 6:1? How does that get measured and paid?
- SSCB Edge Detail shows proposed Type B embankment under the existing flume? Are we removing and replacing any of that flume? Are we regrading that area to 3:1 from a 6:1? How does that get measured and paid?

**A2. The intent was to show that result of that the proposed work would have an effect of steepening the slope. The slope can be measured with rod and level check, a smart level etc., but is not a critical to get this exact. The slope will not be paid for directly but will be subsidiary to related bid items as a result of the proposed work. The flume is not part of the scope of the work. The flume is approximately 4-6' wide and located at the bottom of the channel ditch. It does not extend into the proposed work area, but is something the contractor should be made aware of when working in the area.**

**A construction joint was not intended.**

Q3. The Toewall Detail shows no construction joint between the vertical and horizontal elements of the riprap footing. Is one allowed there?

**A3. A construction joint was not intended.**

Q4. General Notes for Item 132 Embankment states that a PI of 5 to 15 is required for embankment. That's not really a Type B embankment. That's more of a C1 or C2 embankment. Can the proper bid item for that work be added, and the Type B item deleted?

**Q4. Type B is listed as rock, loam, clay and other approved materials in the 2014 specifications. These materials are able to meet the PI requirements. The material must also be free of organic or deleterious material. The stockpile for the material will need to get tested per the specs and must include Atterberg limits (PL, LL to get PI), proctor tests, and sulfates per the General notes, according to TXDOT/ASTM test methods. The moisture density curve will be used to correlate the field nuclear density test to show that compaction is adequate (at least 98% of proctor) and approved prior to any concrete work. The item will be paid under item 132 (Final Density Controlled) and will include furnishing embankment, hauling, placing, compacting, finishing, and reworking, disposal of waste material and equipment, labor tools and incidentals.**

Q5. SSCB Install Layout sheet 39, the last General Note, states that Prep ROW will not be paid until completion of the project. As the first item of work is removing the top 12" of material and hauling it off, subsidiary to Prep ROW, it seems inappropriate to wait and pay that item at the completion of the project. Please clarify the intent of the note.

**Q5. Prep ROW here is meant to remove topsoil and vegetation to prepare for the embankment and pad, but it was also to make sure that that site is maintained for the contractor, subs and inspectors to have access when they need. The designer is not aware of the exact start date of construction or when each separate mowing contract take place. This leaves the possibility that weeds and vegetation may be grown up in the area. Since the anticipated contract time was relatively short (within a few months) and is generally not bid a major ticket item, it was stated this way to keep the site vegetation maintained within the limits described for the duration of the project. It was anticipated that the contractor may have to weed eat the site a time or two if the mowing contracts don't fall within the timeframe of the project.**