CSJ 1937-02-032
Hwy: FM 393
County: Zavala
Pre-bid Questions Log

Question 1: Plan sheets 53-56 indicate Type DS wall backfill, but there are no details indicating the reinforcement length, other than a minimum of 8'. Is there a reinforcement length ratio to height of wall that we can use for the variations in height of these walls?

Based on the RW(CB) Standard the earth reinforcement length is to be calculated using the parameters listed in the standard. In the geo-tech report a design was developed that indicated that the 8' Min length would work for all the retaining walls up to 10 FT. For retaining walls with a max height of 12 ft a 9 ft minimum reinforcement length would be required. These calculations are to be done by the supplier of the Retaining walls as each supplier uses different block weights and sizes. A copy of the geo-tech report can be provided to the contractors and suppliers.
Below are the recommendations listed in the geo-tech report.

Table 6-5 – Recommended Reinforcement Length

Wall	Retaining Wall Station Limits	Max. Wall Height, Feet	Recommended Minimum Reinforcement Length, Feet
RW 1	1000+00 – 1001+00	12.0	9 Feet
	1001+00 – 1008+12	10.0	8 Feet
RW 2	2000+00 – 2003+12	9.5	8 Feet
RW 3	3000+00 – 3003+92	8.5	8 Feet
RW 4	4000+00 – 4004+92	9.0	8 Feet

Question 2: Sheet 59 (Volume 2) shows 2,154 SY of Penetrating Concrete Surface Treatment, which if we go by item 428 is described to be applied to upper surfaces of roadway slabs, sidewalks, medians, curbs, and rails. Sheets 62 and 64 show this material applied to bridge cap faces and wing walls. Item 428 does not address the plan details calling for "Class II". Can you clarify the specification for this surface treatment? How will this item be paid?

Please disregard the "Class II" specification in the notes on sheets 62 and 64. The class specification was used in the old spec book. The quantities are correct in reference to the surfaces shown to be treated on these sheets in addition to the surfaces shown in Item 428 of the 2014 Spec book. The treatment will be paid under Item 428.

Question 3: Regarding the Zavala FM 393 Project (1937-02-032) that lets on the 7th can you please provide the Time Determination Schedule, and any pavement data, cores, or Geotech report that may be available?

Attached please see the following:

1. The Contract Time Determination for Volume 1 of 2 & Volume 2 of 2.
2. CJS 1937-02-032 – Stream Stability & scour analysis report (Comanche and Relief Bridge)
3. CSJ 1937-02-033 – Geotech Report Turkey Creek Bridge

Question 4: Sheets 34-35 indicate the quantity for removal of existing wingwalls to be based upon the number of barrels for the particular box culvert. As wingwalls are typically paid by each, per end of structure, regardless of the number of barrels, do you intend to revise the pay quantity for this item (496-6005)

This item will be paid as per the spec book by each wingwalls structure.

Question 5: After reviewing the time determination schedule; there are several activities that have unrealistic productions, or logic sequences that do not accurately reflect the project. Based on this project scope and sequence we believe a project duration closer to 20 months; resulting in a project duration closer to 500 working days. Please let us know your thoughts.

The highest production rates were used to allow for the bridge to be opened to traffic and provide access to the county road at all times while one bridge is being constructed and the detour is in place. The county road provides access to oilfield sites and local ranches.

Question 6: General note Item 416 notes do not use slurry method for drill shafts. Based on the soil borings in the plans slurry placement method would be preferred by some drilling contractors. Is there a reason why this method cannot be utilized?

Some of the Bore holes indicate the presence of groundwater. Due to past issues in the district, it was determined that the slurry process would not be used and be taken out as per the district general notes.