

## **ADDENDUM #7**

North Hancock Road Extension Phase IIIA and IIIB  
FPN No. 435515-1-58-01; Project No. 2014-11  
Bid No. 14-0030

This addendum is being issued to make the following changes, corrections, clarifications and additions to the bidding document. The information in this addendum modifies and changes the original bidding documents and takes precedence over the original documents. **Receipt of this addendum shall be acknowledged by the bidder by signing and dating the appropriate line on page W-11 of the bid proposal.** Failure to acknowledge this addendum may preclude consideration of the bid proposal for award.

### **Questions asked via E-mail and Answers**

- Q1. These new plans are now showing 4 video cameras at each intersection along with a full set of traffic loops which is completely redundant. The original set of signal plans showed what appeared to be preemption detectors-not video cameras but now both are listed along with the loops. Clarification needs to be made on this.
- A1. **Please delete the 4 video cameras.**
- Q2. In addition to the previous question regarding the video detection, if video is required and the loops are not, then all the associated conduit & pull boxes for the traffic loops would need to be deleted along with establishing video detection zones for the cameras. Please advise.
- A2. **Video detection is not required.**
- Q3. Also the new CAD sheet #1 lists 4-section signal heads but the plans only show 3 section and 5-section signal heads plus the plans appear to cross out the 3-section turn arrow signal heads when they appear to still be required as shown in the plans. Are they instead supposed to be the 4-section signal heads? Please advise.
- A3. **Please delete Flashing 3 section head. Standard 3 section (650-1311) heads required.**
- Q4. Since the addendum #6 includes CAD sheet #1 with quantities but doesn't list the items and quantities for the interconnect, is the interconnect (added in addendum #4) to be included under the signalization pay item? Or will it be under a separate line item on the bid form?
- A4. **To be included as Pay item # 684-14 one mile in length.**
- Q5. Answer #7 of addendum #6 states the specified distance for the power source for the intersection at West Old Hwy 50 & Hancock as being approx.. 1,050 lf. The only thing it mentions for the East Old Hwy 50 intersection though is that the intersection is existing and currently has power but then under the pay items on sheet #1 (provided in addendum #6), it shows a quantity of 3,050 lf for service wire. Now even though this is a lump sum and we have to determine our quantities, this tells me that either the wire is being paid per lf of conductor (which is not congruent with the current FDOT BOE for measurement of electrical service wire-should be all conductors included

per LF) or that there is a large portion of service wire also required at the East Old Hwy 50 intersection but is not shown. Please advise.

- A5. **The quantity of 3,050 LF is for both signals.**
- Q6. Answer #3 in Addendum #6 states the contractor is to bid per the most recent FDOT Basis of Estimates, yet the new red-lined drawings are still showing 630-2-11 as additional bore runs. This would be incorrect and not needed since all runs of directional-bored conduit would be included within the 630-2-12 pay item. Please advise as to whether we are still to hold to the latest FDOT BOE for quoting purposes.
- A6. **Please utilize the 630-2-12 pay item.**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Scott, Construction Inspection Supervisor

9-16-14

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date