

Clark County Public Works

Bid Inquiry Log

Last Update: October 17, 2025

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 #:	PRJ0001796 (CRP 320622)
Title:	NE St. Johns Road Pavement Improvements - (NE 68th Street - NE 78th Street)
Engineer In Charge:	Bart Arthur

Date: September 23, 2025

Question #1: Can you clarify which existing CCP Transvers and Longitudinal Joints require sealant in bid item 25? They are not identified on the drawings.

Reference: Bid Item 25. Spec Section 5-03

Answer: Please refer to note 6 on sheet S1. When finished replacing all the panels all longitudinal and **selected** transverse joints will be cleaned and sealed. **Answer modified and addendum #2 issued.**

Date: September 24, 2025

Question #2: 1. I don't see a bid item for removal of existing roadway striping. Is all existing striping to remain and be striped over? If there is removal of striping please consider adding a bid item.

2. Please confirm the County will provide construction staking including layout out all concrete roadway panel removal limits.

3. Please confirm the County is providing compaction and concrete mix testing.

Reference: Not Identified by inquiry

Answer: In order as asking

1 Existing striping maybe left and painted over.

2 The County will provide surveying and basic layout

3 The County will provide compaction and Concrete testing

Date: September 24, 2025

Question #3: Should there be a bid item for Apprenticeship Utilization per RCW 39.04.320?

Reference: Not identified by inquiry
Answer: No, The project is federally funded

Date: September 25, 2025
Question #4: Is Crushed Surfacing Base or Top Course under Sidewalks and curb ramps paid under Bid Item #20 CSBC?
Reference: Not identified in the inquiry
Answer: Yes

Date: September 25, 2025
Question #5: Can Clark County provide more information regarding lane restrictions? The specifications state the hours allowed for work, but do not specify when lanes may be closed and if they must remain open outside of typical closure hours.
Reference: Not identified in the inquiry
Answer: See Addendum 2 for the clarification.

Date: September 25, 2025
Question #6: Does Clark County intend to use a rapid-set concrete to allow for lanes to be opened to traffic daily at the end of shift?
Reference: Not identified in inquiry
Answer: No, but rapid set is not prohibited

Date: September 25, 2025
Question #7: Does Clark County have specific timelines in mind for the working days/dates work is allowed for each phase of construction?
Reference: Not identified in inquiry
Answer: No

Date: September 25, 2025
Question #8: Would Clark County consider allowing edits to the phasing? In general, we think it may be more efficient to complete all sidewalk and curb construction where possible, then fall back and complete panel replacements. This may depend on Clark County's intention for lane closure restrictions, and how long Clark County intends for work in each phase to last.
Reference: Not identified in inquiry
Answer: Clark County would consider alternate phasing under a CRIP. Bids will be understood to comply with the plans and specifications as they are.

Date: September 25, 2025
Question #9: What date does the County anticipate for notice to proceed?
Given a bid date of October 7th and an estimated contract execution date of November 21st, that would place the approx. 4 months (80 working days) of work during December, January, February and March. Does the County anticipate a work suspension to allow for the work to start during more favorable weather months?
Reference: 1-08.5 time for completion
Answer: No

Date: September 29, 2025
Question #10: Are there as-builts available? If not, how did Clark County determine the "panel depths are approximately 0.58'." contained in note #24 drawing RS1 and RS2?
Reference: plans and specifications
Answer: As-builts posted to builder exchange

Date: September 29, 2025
Question #11: Note 1 on sheet S1 and S2 says if we encounter a panel depth less than 0.58' that the panel "shall be replaced with a 0.58' depth panel, additional excavation and crushed surfacing to achieve full depth panel and maintain rock section will be included with the panel replacement".

Since there is no estimate of how many panels are to be included in the bid, it would make more sense to make this extra excavation and rock as part of a force account contingency item, thereby giving the lowest price
Reference: note 24 sheet RS1, note 1 sheet S1 and S2
Answer: The proposal contains bid item 23 with an Est. unit

Date: September 29, 2025
Question #12: Note 24 sheet RS1 says to "match existing panel depth....." it goes on to say replace a panel less than 0.58 deep with 0.58 deep panel. What if the existing panel depth is greater than 0.58'? Should Section 5-01 be modified to state that additional depth over 0.58' will be compensated by prorating the SY price? If not, then how much contingency depth/contingency area (SY) should Contractors carry in their bid?
Reference: note 24 on sheet RS1 and RS2
Answer: The proposal contains bid item 23 with an Est. unit

Date: September 29, 2025

Question #13: With regard to question #1 and its answer....Note 5 sheet S1 says "sawcut and seal all REPLACEMENT panel transvers jts per A40.15. Note 6 says "existing LONGITUDINAL project wide shall be sawn, cleaned and sealed per detail RD4. Project length is 3,657 lf X 3 joint lines = 10,971 lf which matches bid item no 25 quantity.
should bid item 25 be renamed to delete all of the existing transverse joints (245 ea X 56' = 13,720 lf)?
should you delete the repl panel longitudinal jts from BI quan?

Reference: Inquiry log question #1 answer
Answer: See Addendum 2

Date: September 29, 2025
Question #14: continuation of previous question...
the longitudinal and transverse joints on the replacement panels will be per A-60 and then referred to A-40. This is a DIFFERENT sized joint than the the callout on RD4 for the existing Longitudinal joints project wide. Should the Longitudinal and Transverse joints associated with the replacement panels be INCIDENTAL to the replacement panel bid item and bid item 25 only be LONGITUDINAL JOINTS for the whole project not including incidental jts for panels

Reference: Inquiry log question #1 answer continued
Answer: See addendum 2

Date: September 29, 2025
Question #15: What is Bid Item 27, Epoxy-Coated St. Reinf. Bar, 225 lb for?
Reference: Proposal Form
Answer: Those are for the curb ties on sheet RD3 where we have monolithic sidewalk installed over the panels.

Date: October 2, 2025
Question #16: Note #38 on sheets 8 & 10 show new irregular shaped panels that do not appear to be included in the list of panels on sheet 6 or in the total bid item #21 quantity. Should these panels be added to the panel list and in the bid quantity?

Reference: drawing sheets 8, 10
Answer: This work will be paid under the appropriate bid items and quantities.

Date: October 3, 2025
Question #17: Stage IV shown on sheet 48 does not appear to have a corresponding "additional traffic control" detail sheet callout on sheets TC-2 thru TC-10. Should Stage IV be included on sheet

Reference: TC-04 (sht 51)? Or is there a different traffic control configuration for Stage IV?
Answer: traffic control sheets 48 & 51
TCP depicted on sheet 51 could be used in on Stage IV.

Date: October 3, 2025

Question #18: For Stage X on TC-06--Can the County provide clarification on Note 1 which says to construct stage 10 during weekends.
1. Is there an expectation that stage X is constructed in one weekend such that traffic is driving over the new panel 9:00 am Monday morning? Or is an excavated open hole is plated over so cars can drive over Monday morning, with slab placement the next weekend?
2. Is there an expectation the the panel concrete reach 2,500 psi within the 60 hr closure weekend?

Reference: sheet TC-06, 53 of 62

Answer:

- 1) Per the plans/specs, traffic control for stage 10 needs to be removed by Monday at 5 am. If plating can be installed per specifications, there is not any reason you cannot plate.
- 2) Yes, per the specifications the concrete must test at 2500psi before being opened to traffic.

Date: October 3, 2025

Question #19: Regarding 1-08.5 special provisions that allows for 80 working days for project completion. There does not appear to be enough time to construct 14 stages given the amount of time to setup traffic cntl, demo, place, cure, rem traffic control each stage. Please consider adding 35 additional working days.

Reference: 1-08.5

Answer: The staging shown in the traffic control plans is for dividing the work zones into areas where traffic control can be placed using the traffic control plans and details provided. There are no restrictions on work being performed in more than one stage at a time. Multiple stages can be worked on as long as the requirements of the specifications are met such as keeping one lane open in each direction, and following the traffic control plans at intersections and for lane closures as shown.

Date: October 7, 2025
Question #20: Note #24 on Plan Sheet RS1 notes replacement panels are to be .58' depth concrete.

WSDOT Standard Plan A-40.10-04 (on plan Sheet RD3) calls for 12" thick concrete roadway.

Please confirm replacement panels are to be .58" depth concrete except 10" thick at centerline per plan sheet RS1.

Reference: See question
Answer: Yes, 0.58" thick except 10" at the centerline as shown. The 12" is on HMA transitions not applicable to this project.

Date: October 9, 2025
Question #21: The USDOT recently made changes to DBE program that are effective immediately and will impact recipients of DOT funding. Other Public Works Owners (example: ITD) are removing DBE project goals from their federal-aid projects until DBE firms are reevaluated to see if they still qualify for DBE certification under the new guidelines. Would Clark County consider doing the same so there are no issues that would impact bidders surrounding DBE certification for firms utilized on this project?

Reference: Not identified
Answer: Bid delayed to 10/21/2025, DBE requirements are still included in the bids and contract.

Date: October 9, 2025
Question #22: Addendum #2 was issued yesterday, 10/8/25, that included changes that made considerable alterations to the nature of the work, including but not limited to; material changes, changes to means and methods, work hours, labor wages, work to be performed under the Contract, etc. In light of these changes, would Clark County please move the bid date of the project back by 1 week to 10/21/25 so that bidders have proper time to evaluate these changes, secure additional pricing, and submit proper bids?

Reference: Not identified
Answer: Bid has been moved to 10/21/2025

Date: October 9, 2025
Question #23: There are several questions that we have asked since the bid inquiry log was last updated on 9/30/25. In light of this, would Clark County consider pushing the bid date back by 1 week to 10/21/25 so that bidders have enough time to review responses to these questions and evaluate them properly?

Reference: BIL
Answer: Bid has been moved to 10/21/2025

Date: October 10, 2025
Question #24: Are we allowed to utilize our bid bond with the bid date of 10/14/2025 since the bid has moved?
Reference: Not identified
Answer: potential bidder should contact their bond company and determine the appropriate date.

Date: October 14, 2025
Question #25: Are dowels required on the Concrete Panel replacements?

The WSDOT details on plan sheet RD3 clearly show dowels but the spacing and size (1..5" diameter dowels) shown is overkill for 6" thick concrete pavement.
Reference: PS RD3
Answer: See Addendum 4.
