

**Call 04 Grade, Drain, & Bridge on SR 304/I-269 from I-55 to STA. 240+00, known as Federal Aid Project No. STP-0029-02(013) / 102556310 in DeSoto County.**

- Q1. Will the same consideration be given to this job as it was on the I-269 job bid in September regarding the submittal of a haul diagram to justify waiving the 19 acre rule? This was provided in Addendum #2 NTB 4117.
- A1. Yes, an addendum will be issued to revise the project and expand the 19 acre limit subject to approval of a haul-mass diagram or similar methodology.
- Q2. The I-269 Mainline Cross Section sheets in the plans do not have end areas or volumes included. The local road sheets include the end area and volume. Is it possible to get a revised set of cross sections with the end areas and volumes for I-269 RT and LT prior to bidding?
- A2. Cross Section end areas/volumes can be found in Excel format at the following FTP website: <http://ftp.mdot.state.ms.us/ftp/Construction/District%202/Jan.Letting%202013/>
- Q3. In NTB No. 4167, it states “Memphis Stone and Gravel conveyor to remain within the ROW until January 1, 2015” in the first paragraph. In the last paragraph it states that “at least 150 day notice to Memphis Stone & Gravel of the requested shutdown and move date be given.” If the conveyor is not moved prior to January 1, 2015, there will not be adequate time to construct the end bent and bridge. Please clarify.
- A3. See addendum #2 for a revised NTB 4167.
- Q4. The erosion control pay item quantities seem unusually low.
- A4. See addendum for revised quantities.
- Q5. Does the concrete pile anchorage detail on Sheet 8014, that shows the top 2 feet of the piles to be removed leaving the strands to be incorporated into the footing apply to concrete piles in the end bents or only to the intermediate bents with footings?
- A5. The pile anchorage is only at the intermediate bents.
- Q6. The Class B Structural concrete, Class B Box Bridge Concrete, and the Reinforcing Steel quantities seem to be incorrect.
- A6. Addendum #2 revises the Class B Structural Concrete and Reinforcing Steel quantities.
- Q7. The proposal includes two (2) Special Provisions 907-804-12 Concrete Bridge Decks referencing BD Concrete and changing the air and slump. Are these special provisions included in this proposal in error?

- A7. Addendum #2 removes Special Provision 907-804-12 as it is not needed.
- Q8. The plan and profile sheets have two (2) bridge locations which will require four (4) additional bridge end sections and non-flared terminal end sections.
- A8. Addendum #2 revises the guardrail quantities.
- Q9. Will the guardrail lengths change to 725 LF because of the installation of non-flared terminal ends?
- A9. Addendum #2 revises the guardrail quantities.
- Q10. Regarding the guardrail on this project, pay item 606-E003 Guardrail, Terminal End Section, Non-Flared is provided. However, note 2 on sheet 16 calls for an approved flared terminal end section. Will this project require a flared or non-flared terminal end section?
- A10. Addendum #2 revises the guardrail quantities.
- Q11. On sheet 24 the guardrail quantity section shows your "A", "B", "C", & "D" dimensions as well as the type and quantity of end sections. Typically the "B" dimension is the approach run length and the "D" dimension being the off end run length, with this said, there appears to be eight (8) guardrail runs on this project. However, there is only four (4) Type 1 bridge end sections and four (4) non-flared anchors. The question being, are there eight (8) guardrail runs on this project or four (4)?
- A11. Addendum #2 revises the guardrail quantities.
- Q12. There are two (2) ponds on the job which seem to be manmade. How will they be pumped out since they are below natural ground?
- A12. This work will be absorbed in the clearing and grubbing and any equipment to drain the pond including, but not limited to, pumps, drain lines, etc. will be absorbed.
- Q13. Are there any unusual procedures to be used to treat the bottom of the two (2) ponds prior to constructing the embankment?
- A13. Undercutting the subgrade maybe required and appropriate pay items and quantities will be added in an upcoming addendum #3 for this project.
- Q14. Is the bearing capacity shown on the plans for the Douglas Road pipe piles correct?
- A14. Yes

- Q15. It appears from the boring logs that the not yet advertised project adjoining this project to the East has considerable excess material that meets B9-6. Can this material be utilized as Borrow for this project now being let?
- A15. ~~No~~ No, unless an agreement can be reached between the successful low bidder of each project.
- Q16. Can Bidders assume the side slopes of the cut sections might be cut to a lower slope to obtain more fill from within the project limits?
- A16. The Contractor should bid as per the plans.
- Q17. According to the boring information that describes material for the cut to fill operations under Item No. 203-A003, Unclassified Excavation some of the material meets Class B9-6 as required under Item No. 203-EX035, Borrow Excavation, AH, FME, Class B9-6, but some of it does not meet this requirement due to being non-plastic or having PI of less than 6. The material adjacent to the right of way and adjoining the right of way is also a mixture of material meeting the same soil classification of B9-6, but also, with scattered deposits of non-plastic and less than 6 PI. Can this B9-6 requirement for Borrow be changed to just B9 so that this same mixture of material from off site as that utilized for fill on site be satisfactory for use as Borrow?
- A17. ~~No, the Contractor should bid as per the plans.~~ The requirement and use of Borrow Ex. Class B9-6 has been changed to B9 for all applications, see Addendum #3.
- Q18. If a Borrow source is selected by the Contractor for this project that is adjacent to the not yet advertised project adjoining this project to the East, will the Contractor be allowed to haul up the right of way of that project to this project?
- A18. ~~No, Contractor access for this project will be from I-55.~~ Contractor should reference NTB 4343 in Addendum #3.
- Q19. Should the 16”X16” Prestress Concrete piles listed in the Expedite file have been deleted with Addendum 2?
- A19. Yes, this has been corrected in Addendum #3.
- Q20. Are there boring logs/ Geotechnical Report available for the project? If so, are they available on the FTP site?
- A20. Yes. They are available at the following FTP site:  
[http://ftp.mdot.state.ms.us/ftp/Materials/Geotechnical/102556310-Desoto I-269 Bridges A - E \(ABMB\)/](http://ftp.mdot.state.ms.us/ftp/Materials/Geotechnical/102556310-Desoto I-269 Bridges A - E (ABMB)/)

- Q21. Where can standard drawings GR-1, GR-4, GR-4A, and GR-4B be found as they are referenced in the plans, but are not included?
- A21. The standard drawings can be found at the following FTP site:  
[http://ftp.mdot.state.ms.us/ftp/Construction/District\\_2/Feb\\_Letting\\_2013/STP-0029-02\(013\)/](http://ftp.mdot.state.ms.us/ftp/Construction/District_2/Feb_Letting_2013/STP-0029-02(013)/)
- Q22. Is the quantity of reinforcement within the 20' plug inside the Steel Pipe Pile Anchorage Detail shown on D13 of 28, Sheet 8105 included in the Bridge Summary Quantities?
- A22. Yes, the reinforcement is included in the Bridge Summary Quantities.
- Q23. Will the successful low bidder be allowed to lay the slopes back to generate additional cut material? There is an extreme amount of cut material which can be generated thus eliminating approximately half of the borrow quantity.
- A23. See QandA #16.