City of Pompano Beach, Purchasing Division
1190 N.E. 3rd Avenue, Building C
Pompano Beach, Florida, 33060

October 2, 2013

ADDENDUM #1, BID T-58-13
S.E.9th Avenue Bridge Replacement and New Sidewalk

To Whom It May Concern,

Please review the following additions for this solicitation.

The City of Pompano Beach has posted the following revised documents to our website at www.pompanobeachfl.gov for Bid T-58-13, S.E.9th Avenue Bridge Replacement and New Sidewalk:

- T-58-13 Revised Bid Proposal Sheet
- T-58-13 Revised Civil Sheets C-1, C-2, C-3, C-3A, C-4 and C-7

Clarification of Irrigation System:

The irrigation system was designed by request of the City as a combination of existing to remain independent Homeowner's Irrigation systems within the Right-of-way and a new solar powered system as specified in plans to fill the gaps of no irrigation between homeowner systems as well as irrigation to each tree by means of tree bubblers. It is mandatory to restore and re-establish the existing homeowners' irrigation systems (grading and sodding included) within the Right-of-way that is disrupted by demolition and construction operations. In the end, the entire length of the project must be irrigated providing 100% coverage between existing homeowner systems and the new system fed by City Water and managed by the City. It is in the best interest of the General Contractor to ensure 100% irrigation coverage to minimize cost of replacing sod and/or trees by means of warranty. Bring to the attention of the City Engineer / City Project Manager any issues encountered with Homeowners. Bring to the attention of the landscape Architect any issues with the design. It is expected that the General Contractor awarded this Contract and all of his Subs will work in an amicable, courteous and professional workmanlike manner with Homeowners that are temporarily affected by these improvements.

All Bidders must include the new information into their bid packages.

Please review the following questions submitted by potential bidders, and answers from the City.

Q1: Test pile length is identified on Plan Sheet S-1 as One 60' – 0" long pile. Is this for both the bridge end bents, and bulkhead/architectural structure support?

A1: No, Architectural support pile depth is based on driving resistance and should end up much shorter.

Q2: On plan sheet S-4 detail 7 the max tip for the bulkhead pile is at El – 10.0. On the same page detail 3 the minimum penetration of the pile is 20'. I am confused as to what the pile length should be for the bulkhead, what length should be used?

A2: Vertical pile tip at max elevation -10' msl. Batter pile tip elevation -10' msl with 14 ton bearing based on driving resistance.

Q3: Not sure of the special panel height, on Plan Sheet S-4 detail 8 the panel height is identified as 8'-6". But the End Bent elevations on Plan Sheet S-6 would indicate the panel length being somewhat shorter. Which is correct? Do these elevations conflict with each other or are they given for different locations?

A3: Different locations.

Q4: On plan sheet S-7, are the symbols spaced 16'-0" OC depicted in the Robert Waterway Bridge Plan the locations of the Helical Anchors identified on the same plan sheet detail 2?

A4: Yes.

Q5: Cannot find any detail on the bridge deck. Is the bridge deck intended to be precast deck units? Can you identify the deck thickness, width of the precast units in each phase, rebar type and locations so we can price the bridge deck?

A5: Deck is poured concrete, reinforced as shown on plans S-1 & 2.

Q6: The plans identify the Environmental Classifications for substructure as Extremely Aggressive and superstructure as Moderately Aggressive. Will special admixtures be required in the concrete due to these conditions? See FDOT Specifications for concrete class.

A6: See FDOT Specifications for concrete class.

Q7: The elevation of the bulkhead cap varies. How are we to maintain the 2" embedment of the concrete panels into the cap? Are the panels to be cast to match this slope or can they be cast square on top and the embedment vary from one end of a panel to the other with some minimum/maximum embedment?

A7: Yes; 1.5" min, 2.5" max.

Q8: What are the City's expectations as it relates to the conflict with overhead electric? The line itself conflicts with the pile driving operations or the east bulkhead and end bent and there is it least one existing power pole in the middle of the new sidewalk. Has the City entered into an agreement with the power company to move the line? If this is going to be the contractors responsibility who will pay for the cost? There is no way of knowing how much this may be if costs even apply. In addition the other unknown is the length of time this relocation will take. The impacts to the project from a time delay

aspect are totally beyond the control of the contractor. How do you anticipate dealing with delays due to this issue?

A8: The City will enter into an agreement with FPL to temporarily relocate the affected poles and relocate them back to their original locations at the end of the job.

Q9: What permits are the contractor to procure? Does the City know the cost of these permits? The last project we did in the City of Pompano the Tree Permit was very expensive. Will this be waived? If not can you supply the costs of each tree identified to be removed? Is the tree appraisal cost in the plans the cost charged in the tree permit?

A9: There is a permit allowance stipulated as a percentage of the project cost which will be allocated to this project.

The deadline for acceptance of sealed bids in the Purchasing Office, 1190 N.E. 3rd Avenue, Bldg. C, Pompano Beach, 33060, **HAS BEEN EXTENDED to 2:00 p.m. (local), October 23, 2013.**

The remainder of the solicitation is unchanged at this time. Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the area provided on Page 15 of the bid.

Sincerely,

Otis J. Thomas
Purchasing Agent

cc: website
file