

Clark County Public Works

Bid Inquiry Log

Last Update: October 10, 2016

Responses will be posted on the project's "Bid Inquiry Log", which will be updated twice daily, at noon and 6:00 PM. The Bid Inquiry log will display all questions and answers to the questions that have accumulated by the posting time. Questions too late to be answered as of that posting will remain unanswered. The questions and answers posted on the Bid Inquiry Log at that time will be considered part of the contract and ranked as an Addendum with respect to order of precedence under Section 1-04.2 of the Standard Specification.

Project CRP #:	352722
Title:	2015 Guardrail and Bridge Rail
Engineer In Charge:	Cori Wiessner

Date: 9/27/16

Question #1: You have a bid item to raise guardrail and the specifications indicate on page 85 in section 8-11-5 that the price per foot for raising existing guardrail shall be full payment for all costs to perform the work as described in section 8-11.3 (1) e. With that in mind, when you have an area where the existing guardrail posts are too low the contractor is to replace the post with a new one. My question is: how many posts are too low? where are they located? We need to know this count or the county needs to address this issue with an added bid item.

Reference:

Answer: In the area(s) described under Bid Item 33, "Raising Existing Beam Guardrail," it is not anticipated that the existing posts will need to be raised. Areas where the existing posts are too low to support raising guardrail, Bid Item 32, "Removing and Resetting Beam Guardrail," applies as shown on the plans.

Date: 10/6/16

Question #2: There is no traffic control plan included in the plans for this project. What is the county's intent on the traffic control required for the bridge rail retrofit on bridges #201 & #225? It seems to me that a temp. road closure would be in order as there's no way to accomplish all of the demo & new construction work required in a single shift or allow for the required cure time for the new concrete curb prior to putting traffic on the bridges. It would either be that or 24 hour flagging for the duration of the work at the bridges.

Reference:

Answer: Traffic control for bridges 201 and 225 will be addressed in an addendum to follow.

Date: 10/6/16

Question #3: It appears as if location #5 on this job is also listed as location #10 on the Washougal River Road and Lockwood Creek Road / Hayes Road Safety Improvements Job.

Reference:

Answer: Locations are different. Both are located on Hayes Road. Cardai Hill Road is a loop.

Date: 10/6/16

Question #4: The existing 12" diameter waterline at Br. 201. is currently wrapped in insulation and other pipe coverings. To perform the work the existing pipe wrapping will need to be removed. Is the pipe required to be re-wrapped with new insulation?

Reference:

Answer: The pipe is not required to be re-wrapped

Date: 10/6/16

Question #5: The plans and specifications appear not to address any staging or traffic protection requirements. During removal of the existing bridge rail and curb, the bridge is to remain under traffic, with the railing gone there will be no protection. Please identify the requirement and or staging required for the retrofit of the bridge rail.

Reference:

Answer: Traffic control for bridges 201 and 225 will be addressed in an addendum to follow.

Date: 10/7/2016

Question #6: In the addendum, sheet TC2 is not signed.

Reference:

Answer: The signature does not change bidding. The sheet will be signed in the Construction set.

Date: 10/7/16

Question #7: How is the concrete curb to be connected to the existing wing wall

Reference:

Answer:

The new concrete curbs with new rail are attached to the existing wing walls through drilled epoxy-resin anchors. These details are shown in the following: BR201, Section 2 on page S3; BR225, Section 2 on page S7
