

Call 09 Micro-Surface approximately 14 miles of SR 512 & SR 513, known as State Project Nos. SP-0339-00(010) / 109991301, SP-0349-00(031) / 109992301 & SP-0349-00(032) / 109993301 in Clarke County.

- Q1. 1.) It appears that there may be some Micro Surfacing WD aggregate and emulsion miscalculations. How many square yards are you using to come up with the micro surfacing quantities? 2.) There is an interim completion date of Oct 15th for the main line Micro Surfacing, but the seasonal limitations end on Dec 1st. Can you clarify? 3.) Installing the micro surfacing prior to completing the tree trimming and hot mix items would ensure that damage to the micro surfacing would occur during the execution of those items of work. In addition, the tack coat required for the hot mix items will be tracked on top of the micro surfacing and that will be problematic. Typically, micro surfacing would be the second to last item of work in the sequence and permanent pavement marking would be last. Can the sequence in the specification be amended to allow this? 4.) The specification concerning micro surfacing mix designs calls for Marshall compaction testing. Is it possible to remove this requirement as this procedure has not been used in the micro surfacing design process for decades as more accurate performance related testing is available and required within your specification. 5.) 907-427.02.5 This tack coat section is typical language that is used across the country and should remain in the general specification even though tack coat is never required unless you are applying the micro surfacing to concrete, brick or highly oxidized pavement. In the same spec there is an additional section (907-427.03.3) that contradicts the aforementioned specification. Is it possible to remove the second tack coat section?
- A1. 1.) See Addendum 1 and Addendum 2. 2.) See Addendum 1. 3.) Repairs will not be required for minor visual defects that are not a threat to the traveling public. When the roadway is damaged and the Engineer determines it is a threat to the traveling public or a threat to the lifespan of the roadway, repairs will be required. 4.) Marshall compaction testing may be omitted provided all other specification criteria are met. 5.) 907-427.02.5 and 907-427.03.3 describe different criteria and are both required.
- Q2. Provide width for random clearing scope of work.
- A2. The clearing width is 30' from CL.
- Q3. In addendum #1 the quantity for item 907-418-B001 was reduced from 2,550 tons to 750 tons. Where will this 750 tons be applied? The above reduction of micro surfacing aggregate tons will also require a reduction in item 907-418-A-001 from 76,255 gallons to approximately 21,500 gallons. Will this be addressed in an addendum?
- A3. See Addendum 2.
- Q4. Since my first email with questions concerning this project, I have learned that the tree trimming and removal process requires that metal tracked vehicles such as track hoes etc. will perform most of their work from the pavement surface. These tracked vehicles will without a doubt cause severe damage to the Micro surfacing wd surface or any other surface

for that matter. The tree trimming work should be the first item of work after the sign installation followed by the HMAC items and then the micro surfacing. Is it possible to add more time to the later end of the project to allow for this work sequence?

- A4. Repairs will not be required for minor visual defects that are not a threat to the traveling public. When the roadway is damaged and the Engineer determines it is a threat to the traveling public or a threat to the lifespan of the roadway, repairs will be required.