

ADDENDUM #6

CR 565/Villa City Road from North of SR 50 to South of US 27
Project No. 2024-01, Bid No. 25-517
FPN #447609-1-58-01

This addendum is being issued to make the following changes, corrections, clarifications and additions to the bidding document. The information in this addendum modifies and changes the original bidding documents and takes precedence over the original documents. **Receipt of this addendum shall be acknowledged by the bidder by signing and dating the appropriate line on page W-4 of the bid proposal.** Failure to acknowledge this addendum may preclude consideration of the bid proposal for award.

Addendum #5 moved the bid opening date to October 21, 2026.

Questions Asked Via Email

Q1: The quantity for Remove Existing Structures, Bridge is 150 SF but the Concrete Traffic Railing, Bridge Retrofit Vertical Face is 150 LF. Should the unit be LF for both?

A1: The unit is LS/SF for FDOT pay item 0110-3, for this project it is specified as SF. The unit is LF for FDOT pay item 0521-5-8.

Q2: The bid form issued with Addendum #2 identifies the structural mix as polymer grade 0334 1 53 instead of 0334 1 13. Will a correction be used?

A2: Please see updated bid tabulation form using pay item 0334-1-53 SUPERPAVE ASPHALTIC CONCRETE, TRAFFIC C, PG76-22 for base and all alternates.

Q3: Will the County please reconsider the requirement for unit pricing to match for the same items across all bid forms? Having to price certain items the same across all bid forms, for example, silt fence 272 LF in base bid vs. over 5,000 LF in each alternate, or Remove Existing Concrete for as little as 92 SY and as much as 464 SY or Remove Existing Thermo 660 SF vs 11,101 SF, will arbitrarily inflate the cost off larger quantities by having to cover the cost of lower production items. Please delete that requirement so we may submit the most competitive lump sum bid possible.

A3: Unit prices shall be the same for items listed above. As stated in answer 17, addendum 2, lump sum items such as mobilization, maintenance of traffic and painted pavement markings are exempt from this requirement.

Q4: At what stations can I find Pay Item 0711-17-1 (Remove Existing Thermoplastic) called out in the plans?

A4: Please see Striping Removal Maps attached to this addendum for the limits of striping removal.

Q5: At approx. STA 33+83 plan sheets (Shts 11 & 40) call out specifically to extend an existing double run of 42" cross drain 10 LF at each end, and calls for the existing endwall to remain. There appears at that location to be a triple run of pipe with a very degraded sand-cement endwall. Please clarify the proposed scope of work (with plan details) for this cross drain location.

A5: There are three pipes at this location. Both sand-cement headwalls are to be removed. Headwall and pipe quantities have been updated. Plan revisions are also part of this addendum.

Q6: What are the allowable work hours and lane closure restrictions for this project?

A6: Normal working hours are 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday. Notice must be provided to work on Saturdays. As stated in note 3 on sheet 127; There are no single lane closure restrictions during active work periods.

Q7: Stabilization: In Addendum 1, Question 8, the bidder asked the County to confirm that the commonly accepted FDOT 160-4 6" lime rock base option for stabilization under the Pavement Area of the roadway would be acceptable for construction on this project, and the response was "No substitution will be allowed." Use of this 6" lime rock option in lieu of standard mixing in place of 12" + is an accepted alternate stabilization method, commonly utilized and accepted on widening projects specifically due to daily drop off restoration requirements when temporary barrier wall is not utilized. Other acceptable options include complete removal of the existing roadway soils (app. 28"-30" deep) and replacement with a commercial stabilized import material, blended in another off-site location with an approved LBR. If mixing in place or importing commercial stabilized materials are the only options accepted, the costs for this will be significant and possibly exceed the full project estimate, and will require significantly more time to complete. We are only requesting the 6" lime rock option be accepted for the WIDENING/SHOULDER BASE AND PAVEMENT AREAS, not to include the 4' additional unpaved shoulder (grassed) areas. Please reconsider the response to addendum 1, question 8, and confirm the granular base (lime rock) option can be used under the pavement areas of the project, or provide details why this FDOT approved option will not be allowed by the County to be utilized for this project.

A7: Addendum 1, question 8 FDOT Specification 162-2.4 was referenced. Lake County answered this Substitution would not be allowed. FDOT Specification 162-2.4 does not cover the use of "lime rock base option." The use of "Granular Subbase Substitution" per FDOT Specification 160-2.2 will be allowed.

Q8: 0521 5 8 (Concrete Traffic Railing): Construction of the proposed concrete bridge rails for this bid item will require removal of the existing bridge guard rail, workers and equipment on the existing bridge deck to dowel into the existing bridge curb, installation of forms, reinforcement, placement of the concrete, removal of forms, and finishing of the new concrete. This work will require a minimum of 6-8 days EACH SIDE during which time there will be no drop off protection for active traffic on the existing bridge. Due to this, the bridge cannot be opened daily without drop off protection per FDOT standards. Without the use of temporary barrier wall, utilizing Index 102-603 the work would be required to be continuous, around the clock maintaining an active work zone with a single lane closure utilizing a flagging operation per Index 102-603 as no drop off protection would be provided. The only acceptable temporary drop off protection will be temporary concrete barrier wall on the existing bridge deck, used in conjunction of Index 102-606, utilizing a temporary signal operation to maintain a single traffic lane across the existing bridge to construct the proposed concrete barrier walls. Which of these methods/options will the County prefer or require? A continuous work operation utilizing Index 102-603 or temporary barrier wall and a single lane operation utilizing 102-606? Or will the County allow either option to be selected by the Contractor? Please clarify which option will be required by the County for this work, or provide other options that can be utilized.

A8: The awarded Contractor shall provide an MOT plan to be reviewed and approved by Lake County prior to starting work. Depending on the Contractor's method of bridge construction will dictate the allowable MOT plan. Both Index 102-603 and 102-606 could work with barrier wall and temporary signals.

Q9: According to the driveway detail provided in Addendum #2, the asphalt driveways get 1" of asphalt, 6" limerock base (OBG 04), and 12" compacted subgrade and the concrete driveways get 6" compacted subgrade. We do not have pay items for that work. Will pay items be added?

A9: 522-2 Concrete Sidewalk and Driveways 6" Thick were included however we have added 0285 704 Optional Base Group 4, Unit SY and we have adjusted the quantity for 0334 1 53 Superpave Asphaltic Concrete, Traffic C, PG 76-22 to account for asphalt driveways. Contractor shall place 1.5" of Superpave Asphaltic Concrete, Traffic C, PG 76-22 on asphalt driveways.

Q10: The County has provided a quantity of 413 SY for 6" concrete driveways across all bid schedules. I am coming up with approximately 486 SY. There are 3 locations called out within the base bid limits (~88 SY) and 17 locations called out within Alternate #2 limits (398 SY). Can the County please confirm their quantity?

A10: Quantity is 469 SY.

Q11: Addendum #2 issued a new bid sheet within the addendum, a new excel sheet was not provided. Will an updated excel sheet be forthcoming?

A11: A new bid form has been uploaded to the Procurement website titled "Addendum #6 Revised Bid Tabulation."

Q12: Addendum 2 semi clarified the statement on the bid form regarding keeping unit prices uniform for all alternates and base bid: "The same unit price should be used consistently for the same pay items in the bid tabulation across all sections". Lump sum items and painted pavement markings, earthwork have been exempted. Request County consider removing this requirement in its entirety for all bid items. The bid items that are not exempted should be for the same reasons.

A12: Please see Answer 3 of this addendum

Q13: Addendum 2 clarified the type of friction course to use and specified the correct bid item number; however, the number is not changed on the bid form. Per answer A23 the bid item should be 334-1-13 and still reads 337-7-83.

A13: A revised bid form has been uploaded to the Procurement website titled "Addendum #6 Revised Bid Tabulation."

Q14: Addendum 1 states that an Alternate 3 will be forthcoming. Will that be issued soon?

A14: Addendum #3 has been released and contains Alternate 3. It should be noted Alternate 3 as discussed in the pre bid meeting has been changed to Alt 1-A. Lake County intends to award Alt 1-A with Alternate 1 if budget allows.

Q15: Addendum #1 answer to question 8 forbids the use of lime rock in lieu for the stabilization. Is there a particular reason why the County will only accept mixed subgrade? This is normally a contractor option.

A15: Please see Answer 7 of this addendum

Q16: Alternate 1-A does not have a line item for mowing and litter removal. Is this not required for this alternate?

A16: Yes it is required, please see revised bid tabulation pages attached.

Q17: Would the County allow a detour to enable closure of the bridge to perform the improvements outlined in the plans on the bridge?

A17: A detour will not be allowed due to the length of the detour route.

Q18: During our review of the contract documents, we identified a discrepancy between the quantity of 30-inch RCP shown in the Bid Schedule and the quantity indicated on Sheet 03 of the Summary of Drainage Structures. The Bid Schedule indicates a total quantity of 11 LF of 30-inch RCP, while Sheet 03 of the Summary of Drainage Structures indicates 58 LF. Please review and confirm the correct quantity of 30-inch RCP to be used for construction and payment purposes.

A18 Sheet 3 of the construction plans as well as the bid tabulation call for 47 LF in Alternate 1 and 11 LF in Alternate 2 for a total of 58lf.



Terry Scott, Bridge and Construction Management Director