Call 02 Paving on SR 304 / I-269 from SR 305 to SR 302, known as Federal Aid Project Nos. STP-0029-02(018) & STP-0029-03(015) / 102556306, 307, & 318 in Desoto & Marshall Counties.

Q1. The proposal shows enough quantities for 4 traffic signals, but the plans only show a traffic signal for 1 intersection. Which is correct?

A1. See fax letter for this project dated 6/15/16.

Q2. Where is the IMSA 20-1 (AWG 10, 2 Conductor), (AWG 6, 2 Conductor), (AWG 8, 2 Conductor) cable intended to be used on this project? Typically the IMSA cable is used from the service pole to the Traffic Signal Controller Cabinet. The plans show 841 of the IMSA 20-1, AWG 8 , 2 Conductor to be used for the traffic signals and the balance of the AWG 8, 2 Conductor to be used for the ITS Items. Typically, all wiring for ITS equipment is THHN/THWN, 3 or 4 conductor. I could not locate where any of the other IMSA cable listed above will be used.

A2. The 10/2C and 6/2C IMSA cables are used for power to the CCTV locations. These are located on 3006, 3008, 3009, and 3011. At some locations, the power runs from one CCTV location to another. (3008 to 3009). The 8/2C runs from the CCTV location on 3003.

Q3. **1.** Per sheet number 3034, what is the wall thickness for the 2" Fiberglass (FRP) pipe running through the conduit bank? **2.** Also, how many bridge expansion joints exist on this bridge (I-269 over Coldwater River)?

A3. **1.** A specified wall thickness is not provided; however, it must meet all specification requirements and be capable of handling the wire sizes required. **2.** Reference the project plans.

Q4. The STP-0029-03(015) plan set cover sheet indicating the area covered by each plan sheet lists sheets 3 starting at STA. 878+00.00 and ending at sheet 15 EOP STA 1247+3.50. The actual ITS plan sheets numbered ITS-1 through ITS-13 appear to correspond. Is there a corrected plan set, or can you confirm that there is an offset error?

A4. Roadway (plan profile sheet numbers) and ITS sheet numbers were not intended to correspond; however, the station ranges in both cover the project from the BOP to EOP.

Q5. NTB 6114 Traffic Management Center Modifications under Equipment-Lease Line Service indicates that the Contractor is to install an AT&T Metro-E lease line service and a Cisco 2811 router to connect the I-69/I-55 communications hut to the statewide TMC. This appears to be well outside the project limits, and appears to duplicate a previous project [CM-0017-00(041)] requirement. Should this be disregarded?

A5. See the addendum to the project.

Q6. **1.** Item 209-A004 Geotextile Stabilization, Type V, Non-woven 155,940 SY in plans for I-269/SR304 from North of US 78 to SR 302 Marshall County. Where is this material to be used? We cannot find typical sections or breakdown for this item. **2.** Also in the other set of plans (I269 SR 305 to East of Macon Rd.) it shows 2,381 SY in Marshall County for Item 209-A004 which matches quantity for item 815-E001 Geotextile under Riprap. Is this correct?

A6. **1. & 2.** See the addendum to the project.

Q7. NTB 6116 Location & Configuration of Communications Nodes calls for M and S1 optical transceivers. The M-optical module is rated for 0.03 miles (intra-facility usage) and the S1 optic for 4.2 miles. Both of the required modules are inadequate to bridge the approximate 10 mile and 28 mile links to other node locations. S2 transceivers (optical modules) rated at 20 miles and L2 transceivers rated at 43.2 miles are needed. Should the M1 and S1 transceivers be replaced with S2 and L2 transceivers as necessary, should they be supplied in addition to S2 and L2 transceivers, or bid in a different manner as directed by MDOT?

A7. See the addendum to the project.

Q8. In response to A2: So even though the drawings show a 3 conductor wire we are only installing a 2 conductor per the pay item? Are we using the ground rod to establish a ground at each device instead of pulling a ground wire? We are installing a ground wire on one set of plans and not on the other? Also, we are installing IMSA cable on one set of plans and THHN on the other even though it is for the same application, powering the same type of equipment.

A8. See the addendum to the project.

Q9. Please clarify or confirm the following understanding of NTB 6114 Traffic Management Center (TMC) Modifications Equipment subsection: Video Systems. The IP cameras on this project are to be integrated into MDOT's existing video system in the statewide TMC in Jackson. The single analog camera installed under 907-639-PP001 is to be integrated into the existing analog video equipment in the Southaven Police Department and an IP stream integrated into the statewide TMC in Jackson. No new IP or analog video equipment is to be installed in the Southaven Police Department.

A9. Confirmed

Q10. Plan sheet EQ-TSI sheet # 21 show no detection for the east side of 302 signal, please advise

A10. The detection was installed on a previous project. It will not be required on this project.

Q11. ITS-9 on 102556318 shows a 7.5 KVA Transformer at the electrical demarcation. What is the transformer for? If this is a step-up transformer there would have to be a step-down transformer somewhere. This service is shown to be a 120V/240V service that provides power to CCTV Site #5. It shows (2) circuits running back to the South on I-269 but I am not sure what the purpose of these (2) circuits are. These circuits are shown on ITS-8 and appear to be routed to CCTV Site #4 but this site is also shown to be powered from the Electrical Demarcation on ITS-8.

A11.The transformer on ITS11 will not be needed, but will be utilized on ITS 8. The power service point for CCTV site 5 is on sheet 8 (ITS8). The addendum adds a step up transformer on ITS8 to match the step down on ITS9 for CCTV5.