

Call 01 Grade, Drain, Pave on SR 2 from existing SR 15 to SR 15 Bypass & Grade, Bridge, 2 Lanes on SR 15 from just north of the Union County Line to 1 mile north of SR 4 at Ripley, known as Federal Aid Project Nos. STP-2911-00(001) / 105890301 & STBG-0022-04(070) / 101631301 in Tippah County.

- Q1. Notice to Bidders 5622 states that "the expansion of the 19-acre limit will be considered for a maximum disturbed acreage of no more than forty (40) acres". With multiple grading, box culvert, and bridge sites working concurrently, the specified forty acres will not be sufficient. Would MDOT consider increasing the maximum disturbed acreage to no more than one hundred (100) acres?
- A1. **Revised answer:** ~~The Department is in the process of evaluating this request.~~ See addendum 1.
- Q2. Can the geotechnical report for the project be provided?
- A2. Geotechnical information can be downloaded here: <https://file-exchange.mdot.state.ms.us/dl/?f=4a7a0ba8a8cbdf10fca674a0f35fe4bfb6305f1e>
- Q3. Item No 40 Removal of Asphalt Pavement, All Depths - 46,250 SY does not appear in plans. Item No. 100 Removal of Pavement, All Types and Depths - 53,093 SY is what is shown in plans. Please clarify.
- A3. See addendum 2.
- Q4. Pipe Quantities in plans do not match bid quantity items. **1.)** Item 780 18" RCP CL 4 - 104 LF is not shown as CL IV in plans. **2.)** Item 790 18" RCP CI 5 48 LF is not shown as CL V in plans. **3.)** Item 800 18" RCP CI 5 CI B Bedding 216 LF is shown as 184' on profile sheet. **4.)** Item 860 36" RCP CI IV - 712 LF - plans show 452 LF of this quantity as Class V not Class IV (no pay item shown). **5.)** Item 1040 36"x23" CAP CI A III - 256 LF -SR15 plans show 56 LF & SR 2 Plans show 256 LF = 312 LF vs 256 LF. Please clarify.
- A4. **1.)** Quantity includes 104' of stack pipe not included on the MI-2 labels in the WK sheets. **2.)** Quantity includes 48' of stack pipe not included on the MI-2 labels in the WK sheets. **3.)** Quantity includes 32' of stack pipe not included on the MI-2 labels in the WK sheet. **4.)** See addendum 2. **5.)** 256 LF includes alternate pipe at Sta. 31+00 on EQ-6 & alternate pipes under driveways Sta. 820+66, Sta. 859+26, and Sta. 971+90 on EQ-10. This is also included on the WK sheets.
- Q5. The geotechnical information provided only provides data related to the bridge structures on the project. Is additional geotechnical information available related to the roadway grading outside of the bridge locations?
- A5. Additional geotechnical information can be downloaded here: <https://file-exchange.mdot.state.ms.us/dl/?f=dd5b3e5f86b62fa244792204e05a01eba610ffc1>

- Q6. Can MDOT provide grading files for the project?
- A6. The successful bidder will be provided these upon award.
- Q7. On G1 of 27 & G9 of 27 the lengths for Drill Shafts do not match for Bents 2 & 3. Please Clarify. Also Bid Item Quantities for Line Items 2120, 2130, 2150 & 2160 do not match the plan quantities shown on sheet number 22 SQ-5. Should these not all need to be 3000 LF?
- A7. **Revised answer:** See addendum 2 for Drilled Shaft information. Regarding Line Items 2120, 2130, 2150 & 2160, the bid sheets include quantities from STP-2911-00(001) / 105890301 as well as quantities from STBG-0022-04(070) / 101631301.
- Q8. On sheet # 8132 the neoprene pads are labeled with LP. All other drawings refer to the plain pads PP. Please confirm the is in fact a plain pad.
- A8. See addendum 2.
- Q9. Will a list be provided for the removal and reset of permanent signs? Is what is listed in the quantity sheets the only concrete that will be paid for under signage quantities?
- A9. It is not intended for any permanent signs to be removed and reset. Pay item 619-D3001, Remove and Reset Signs, All Sizes, is intended for temporary traffic control signage. Yes, any other concrete required for sign footings not listed in the plans shall be absorbed in other sign items.
- Q10. What class of concrete will be specified for the spread footings?
- A10. The concrete for the retaining wall leveling pad is Class "C" and will conform to the requirements shown in Notice to Bidders No. 22.
- Q11. Will the non-ex Flowable Fill require Class F Fly Ash?
- A11. Refer to Section 612 of the 2017 Standard Specifications.
- Q12. If concrete is used for H-pile encasements, will it be subject to sulfate issues?
- A12. No soluble sulfates were indicated at or near ground level.
- Q13. Will this project use the proposed change where the ready-mix producer is responsible for hiring the QC testing?
- A13. No.
- Q14. What class of concrete is required for the medians?

A14. Refer to Section 616 of the 2017 Standard Specifications.

Q15. Will a water proofing admixture be specified on the bridge deck concrete?

A15. No.

Q16. Will Sunday work be allowed?

A16. No.

Q17. MDOT provided some CADD files available for download on the letting page. Would MDOT mind adding the alignment files to the CADD files available for download?

A17. The successful bidder will be provided these upon award.

Q18. Is there a detail of the Ditch Paving for the SR 2 Plan set (STP-2911) like is shown on the Plan and Profile of the SR 15 plan set (STBG-0022)? It shows Length, Depth, and Flat Bottom Width.

A18. No.