

**ACNH-9204-00(001)/100486**  
**I-55 Split Diamond Questions and Answers**

Question 1. Are as-built plans of the Madison Ave and Steed Road Bridges that are scheduled for demolition available through MDOT?

Answer 1. As-built plans for these bridges are located at the following FTP site:  
<http://ftp.mdot.state.ms.us>  
Download a File  
Roadway\_Design  
Public  
Asbuilts-for-100486-301

Note:

5448\_I-091-2(16)OLD-Asbuilts – Original Asbuilt plans.  
NH-SP-0055-02(190)N-FinalPlans – Final Constructons Plans of the recent “Add 2 Lanes” project. We have not received Asbuilts yet of the project.

Question 2. Is the above referenced project currently on schedule to be bid in the March 27, 2012 letting, or will it be postponed to the April 2012 letting?

Answer 2. The project will be officially withdrawn from the February advertisement, but will be re-advertised in the March letting. Bids will be received on March 27, 2012. Proposal holders prior to the withdraw of the project will be sent a new proposal (of like kind) at no cost when the proposals are ready for the March letting.

Question 3. Entergy will not give estimate for the monthly electricity bill to the contractor on the Madison County MDOT Project stating the prices could change due to the length of the project.

Answer 3. Contact Mr. Steve Lee, Manager, Customer Operations Support with Entergy Mississippi, Inc. at (601) 969-4810 or [SLEE@entergy.com](mailto:SLEE@entergy.com) for questions related to power service information. It is the Contractor’s responsibility to make these arrangements and MDOT is not responsible for information provided by Entergy.

Question 4. Can MDOT define the allowable haul routes? I request MDOT to take the lead with the city and county on this issue and assign those routes or give some guidance. It’s a very important variable to costs and timeliness.

Answer 4. No, MDOT only provides access via the State maintained system. Local Officials will need to be contacted for access through their system.

Question 5. Due to timeliness, will MDOT allow the Erosion Control Plan be submitted in phases and outline the phases expected, so as to allow a timely NTP with work.

Answer 5. The erosion control plan can be submitted in phases in accordance with Notice to Bidders No. 3741.

Question 6. If there is no way to provide a network of street haul for the job access, then can temporary ramps of ingress and egress of I-55 be allowed by using shoulder closures, with acceleration type setup.

Answer 6. Notice to Bidders No. 3743 addresses lane closure restrictions. Ingress and egress of construction traffic with Interstate traffic would require a lane closure that would have to comply with NTB 3743. Permits for access directly to the Interstate Right-of-Way may be requested in writing and would require approval from MDOT and FHWA.

Question 7. Is there a possibility this project will be pulled from March letting due to lack of funding? Contractors are spending time and effort on preparing this bid and would like a heads up if the project is definitely going to bid.

Answer 7. See the answer to question no. 2

Question 8. Sheet 500, 501, 502, 503, 550, 551, 552, 553, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, and 597 all state:

The Deck Pouring Schedule Shall Be As Shown On These Plans. Alternate Sequence Will Not Be Approved.

Sheets 500 and 501 (I-55 over Steed Road Right Lane) show Pour 1, Pour 2, Pour 3, Pour 4, and Pour 5 to be performed on each side of the CL of the Bridge with a Closure Pour to follow.

Sheets 502 and 503 (I-55 over Steed Road Left Lane) show two (2) Pour 1's, Pour 2, Pour 3, and Pour 4 to be performed on each side of the CL of the Bridge with a Closure Pour to follow.

Sheets 550, 551, 552, and 553 (I-55 over Colony Park Blvd Right and Left Lanes) show Pour 1, Pour 2, Pour 3, Pour 4, Pour 5, Pour 6, and Pour 7 to be performed full width of the bridge.

Sheets 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, and 597 (I-55 over Madison Avenue Right and Left Lanes) show two (2) Pour 1's, Pour 2, Pour 3, Pour 4, Pour 5, and Pour 6 to be performed on each side of the CL of the Bridge with a Closure Pour to follow.

Would not consistent pour sequences for all of the bridges help eliminate potential errors (such as, all with closure pours or all full width and/or all with multiple pour 1's or all single pours)?

Answer 8. The project should be bid based upon the pour schedule and phasing of the bridges as per the plans. After the execution of the contract, alternate pour schedules and phasing may be submitted for approval by MDOT. It shall be MDOT's sole discretion on the approval of alternate plans to construct the bridges.

- Question 9. Concerning the Traffic Signal Plans it shows a Type 3 Pull Box (according to bid items) at each controller. On the ITS plans it shows a Type 5 Pull Box for fiber. If you are using a Type 5 Pull Box you should be able to do away with the Type 3 Pull Box. A Type I Pull Box is not needed at all on this project.
- Answer 9. Pull box types, quantities, and locations should be bid as per plan sheets.
- Question 10. Concerning the prints there is nothing stated about the power to the Traffic Signal Controllers. Entergy will not give a price for hook up due to these being new sites. The Contractor should not be responsible for meeting Power Company and inquiring to see how to get power to each site. Baker Engineering should be the responsible party for this task.
- Answer 10. See answer to Question No. 3 previously posted.
- Question 11. Concerning the Street Name Signs to be installed on the Signal Arms are they to be designed to meet Ridgeland/Madison Specifications or MDOT Standard Specifications?
- Answer 11. The street name signs shall be in accordance with MDOT Specifications. Any reference in the contract documents referring to City of Madison or Ridgeland Specifications shall be disregarded.
- Question 12. What are the over-all dimensions on the OTN Node Communication Huts?
- Answer 12. A Notice to Bidders will be included in the reprint of the contract documents defining the dimensions and other specifics regarding the huts.
- Question 13. Looking through the plans for this project the General Notes, page 2 Sheet 10.1 (17) there is mention of a soil profile available. Is this profile in an electronic version so that I may forward it on to our structure design folks?
- Answer 13. The soil profiles are available at the following ftp site under soil profiles:  
[\\ftp\ftp\Download\Roadway\\_Design\Public\Asbuilts-for-100486-301](ftp://ftp.Download/Roadway_Design/Public/Asbuilts-for-100486-301)
- Question 14. Where might one find the spec 907-630-4 referenced on sheet 100.291A note #6?
- Answer 14. The reference to 907-630-4 is incorrect. The correct reference should be to 907-630-9 which is included in the contract. Also, a Supplement to 907-630-9 will be included in the new proposal.
- Question 15. Is it safe to assume that there will be a revised note #1 from sheet 100.263 as it is referencing the signal interconnect cable as copper and the plans show a fiber interconnect cable?
- Answer 15. A revised note will be forthcoming. The signal interconnect cable shall be fiber.
- Question 16. Concerning drilled shaft excavations for overhead sign structures. Will geo investigation be required for each sign foundation location or will the foundation designers be permitted to use the project soil profile being supplied to design the foundations?

Answer 16. The contractor will be responsible for performing soil borings at each location to be used in the design of the foundations and supports in accordance with the Supplement to 907-630-9. The Supplement to 907-630-9 will be included in the new proposal which addresses this issue.

Question 17. Where is Assembly 30 Cross Section Drawing located in the contract drawings? Assembly 28 & 29 are DMS-1 & DMS-2. Is Assembly 30 actually required or should this item be deleted?

Answer 17. It is located on Sheet TC-11. Assembly No. 30 is the temporary sign assembly required on the temporary crossover.