

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 120284

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

DEL-79370 - US-23-17.64

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 3:54:37 PM

Per the general notes on page 10, 442 Asphalt Surface Course, 9.5mm, Type A (446) APP material from Sta. 256+00 to 289+00 is to use binder from Nustar Refinery in Paulsboro N.J.

Is there a special or specific reason for using this material?

Please recognize that the liquid material haul from New Jersey will be about a 12 hour trip and would be a significant logistic challenge. The use of this binder will substantially increase the cost of the asphalt mix in this section.

If this material must remain in the contract, please provide a separate reference number for this material since it will be significantly more expensive than the remainder of the material in this reference number.

Question Submitted: 5/8/2012 2:01:30 PM

Addendum #1 revised sheet 7 of the plans and provided a breakdown of the base pavements under the 11" concrete. A large portion of the repairs are in the section with 11" concrete over 6" Lean Concrete Base (BONDED). As these two pavements are BONDED TOGETHER, is it the owner's intent to remove both the 11" concrete and the 6" base? If so, how will this be paid.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 3:48:30 PM

Sheet 10: Perpetual Pavement Asph Mix Design, 2nd Column, 7th Paragraph

The note states that representatives from Ohio University will provide sampling containers and collect approx: "14000 pounds" of loose mix from each asphalt pavement lift.

Q. Is this amount correct? How will the contractor be paid for this material?

The amount shown is correct. The cost of the material samples will be incidental to the pay item.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 3:40:21 PM

Sheet 10: Item 442 Asph Conc, 9.5MM Type A (446) APP

Plan note states binder shall be used from Nustar from Sta. 256+00 to 289+00 and liquid from a source other than Nustar from Sta. 284+50 to Sta. 303+10.

Q. Is the area northbound, southbound or both directions?

Q. The stationing overlaps if the area being paved is only one direction. Please correct and/or clarify the limits each direction.

Q. Can you split this work into two reference items since they are 2 different materials with very different unit costs.

Thank You

Question Submitted: 4/18/2012 10:15:19 AM

Reference is made to pay ref.# 120 DOWEL BAR RETROFIT, APP. The detail on plan sheet 38 shows using a 1-1/2" x 18" deformed bar. That would be a #12 rebar, but the re-bar industry does not roll a # 12 bar. Check the 2010 ODOT CMS on page 308- no #12 rebar is shown. I suggest using a #11 x 18" deformed bar which is always available.

Question Submitted: 4/13/2012 10:09:34 AM

The typical sections on sheets 7 & 8 show the existing pavement being +/-18" Asphalt + Base. Please revise to show the correct existing concrete section.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 120294

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

MED-78233 - LR-BRUNSWICK SIGNALS

Question Submitted: 5/8/2012 3:06:07 PM

Ref 11 & 12 Curb Ramps, General Summary and Sub Summary have curb ramps in sf proposal has each, if each is correct does it include removals and replacement of walk at curb ramps?

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 8:10:40 PM

Addendum # 2 increased the quantity of bid reference item # 110 Signalization, Misc." Sight Impaired Detection" to 20. These are to be located at the three intersection shown on sub-summary page 27. These same locations are also shown to be provided with bid reference # 78, Pedestrian Pushbutton, As Per Plan. These items would be duplicates of each other at the same locations. One of these items should be non- preformed or made an alternate? Which type of button is to be used at these three locations?

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 7:55:37 PM

The sub-summary on plan page 25 lists 6 pedestrian signals on page 53 at Center Rd. & Fire Station; however, the details on page 53 do not show that these are required and the intersection layout on page 51 also does not show these. Are these required? If so, where are these to be mounted?

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 7:09:19 PM

The sub-summary on plan page 28 lists 3 sign hanger assembly as per plan on page 106; however, page 106 actually has 8 sign hanger assemblies. Likewise the sub-summary shows 3 sign hanger assemblies on page 109, but the details on this page show 4 assemblies. Will addendum be issued to correct this item?

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 7:04:45 PM

Plan Page 91 shows two R10-11b "NO TURN ON RED" Fiber Optic Blank Out Signs that do not have a pay item in the proposal to perform this work.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 7:02:43 PM

The sub-summary on plan page 28 lists 6 internally illuminated signs located at the intersection of Grafton Rd. & N. Carpenter / Fire Station Pages (Page 91 & 93). However plan page 91 only shows 4 signs. This changes the total of this item to 78 signs.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 6:53:43 PM

Signal W3 on plan page 81 is a proposed 1 section 12" signal with a green arrow that does not have a pay item in the proposal. Will an addendum be issued to add this item?

Question Submitted: 5/4/2012 2:29:04 PM

No plan sheet 148/168 The Removal of Monument Sign and reerection, Can ODOT give more detail of this item. Are we to remove the sign from the existing structure and install on a new structure being built by others. Or are we to move the structure, if so is it embedded in concrete, or on foundation if so what size foundation and rebar? and are the post wood, steel. If this embedded in concrete you will not be able to pull and reuse.

The sign is supported by two wood posts (probably 6x6 or 8x8, give or take). Posts are embedded in concrete. The intention is to reinstall the sign in the new location in the same fashion as existing, i.e. pour new embedding concrete if necessary.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2012 7:30:49 AM

Sheet 14/168 makes mention of a Buckeye pipeline, nowhere in the plans did I see it show up, there are conditions to trenching around this pipeline, can ODOT tell us where this pipeline is located. Also Ref: 80 Loop Detector Units, are these for the new cabinets or going somewhere else. If they are for the new cabinets they should be covered under spec. 733.02 P , why are they listed separate.

The Buckeye Pipeline is shown on sheet 97.

The loop detector units are not covered under 733. This is a controller specification. They are a 632 item covered under 732.07 and the additional requirements of the plan note.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/30/2012 1:20:02 PM

Can you please check the quantity of bid item #52, "Overhead Sign Support, Type TC-16.12, Design 12", the bid proposal and summary sheets list it at 6 each, the sign plan pages (101-111) indicate that 7 each are to be installed, which is correct? Can you also check the quantity of bid item #85, "Signal Support Foundation, As Per Plan" the bid proposal and summary sheets list it at 79 each, there are 81 each Type 81.21 signal supports to be installed on this project, which is correct?

Question Submitted: 4/26/2012 1:34:32 PM

Can you check the quantity of Sight Impaired Detection Equipment, there is a qty. of 3. One at 3 different intersections should there not be 8 at two of them and 4 at the other.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/26/2012 10:30:57 AM

The plan note on page 12/168 System Analysis as per plan states " the work shall be performed by an Engineering Consultant Firm that is prequalified by ODOT in basic traffic signal design and also traffic signal system design".

My question is why is this project's qualifications different than ODOT spec 633.17 B Systems Engineer or Technician. If you meet all the qualifications in ODOT spec. 633.17 you should be able to perform the System Analysis.

We ask this note be changed to, perform Systems Analysis to meet ODOT spec. 633.17

The City requests, for this project due to its complexity and size, that the work be performed by an engineering firm that has been pre-qualified by ODOT for signal system design. The current 633.17 specifications does not insure that a professional engineer will be responsible for this work since it allows a technician without responsible charge by a professional engineer to prepare this work.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2012 1:37:08 PM

On plan sheet 3/168 there is a Installation Layout Note which states " an Ohio Licensed Professional Surveyor to make the traffic signal supports and all other stationed signal items.

We feel this note is adding a lot of undue cost to this project at bid time and a lot of potential change order cost as the project moves forward. With this note every time a foundation or pullbox, controller foundation or loops are moved the project will have to shut down (which is lost time chargeable to the project) until a surveyor is brought back to the site to re-lay out from the original plans (which means extra survey costs that will be charged to the project as extra costs).

Our past experience installing traffic signals there seems to be a lot of items that do not go in as plan,(as per the note about not ordering poles before the foundations are installed) was made for this reason.

The plans for this project give center line and stations at the center of the intersection, this information should be all that is needed for a project superintendent (or a competent personnel as the spec. book calls them) to do the lay out and can easily be checked by a ODOT project Engineer if there are any questions. This project is being built on existing ground conditions so elevations are known.

We suggest that this note be eliminated to save this project the unnecessary costs and possible time delays associated with it.

Project No. 120298

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

SAN-85272 - US-6/53/101-12.99/0.00/2.15

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 7:43:41 AM

The link to the revised plans for addendum 3 takes you to the wrong location, please correct this.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 5:01:54 PM

The revised plan sheets for Addendum No. 3 were received this afternoon. The closure durations for the structure work was increased from a total of 44 days to 90 days, however the 60 day completion requirement for all work shown on sheet 12 was not increased. Please consider a corresponding increase in the total project duration, or eliminate the duration to let the completion date govern project completion.

The duration of the project is based upon 60 working days excluding holidays and weekends. The closure times are based on calendar days and the structures can be closed at the same time. This should allow the work to be completed during the duration of the project.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:03:34 AM

Pages 72, 73, & 74 are all the same. Page 75 does not appear to be the correct abutment details and there are no drawings showing abutment removal limits. Please review.

Please see the previously submitted addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 7:01:44 AM

How will removal for the 10" Concrete Pavement and the 6" undercut for 304 stone be paid?

Also please include information or typical section on the pavement removed thickness of the two locations.

Project No. 120302

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

WAR-76374 - SR-122-4.52

Question Submitted: 5/9/2012 10:31:46 AM

The quantities for Lines 26,27,28 (Cement Stabilized subgrade) do not appear to be consistent. Please verify that the quantities are correct.

Question Submitted: 5/9/2012 10:17:18 AM

Proposal calls for quantity of 8 - TC-81.10 Design 10 poles (bid reference #148) and a quantity of 6 - TC-81.10 Design 12 (bid reference #149). We only find 4 design 12 poles in the plans. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 5/9/2012 9:24:56 AM

The answer for question states "see addendum for details." Where are the details?

The details mentioned in the answer to the prebid question is the added line to the note with "Step A" heading on sheet 14 per the addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2012 3:35:04 PM

On page 11, under the note for Abandonment of Drinking Water Wells, it is stated that impacted properties may have a new well drilled or be connected to the existing water service. Is it up to the contractor to drill a new well or connect to existing water service under this pay item? Or is just the abandonment work required?

Per the note, the contractor is to drill a new well or connect to the existing water service line.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 8:20:34 AM

Will the 8'x4' culvert at 233+67 SR-122 be constructed part width with traffic maintained or will it be constructed with the road closed to through traffic?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2012 2:09:55 PM

Page 10/326 - Indiana Bat paragraph states that this project is within the summer breeding range. Have the Bat trees been topped for this project? Was the completion date taken into account if these trees have not been removed? Please advise

Question Submitted: 4/18/2012 8:34:23 AM

Could all of the CADD files be made available?

Project No. 120313

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

GUE-21494 - IR-70-6.55

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 8:27:30 AM

On reference number 52 and 53 you state both 4" and 6" widths on the EBS. Plans call for 6" and that is the new ODOT standard for Interstate markings. Can you change the proposal to clear up any confusion. On reference 42 ebs states 8" but the plans call for 12". Please clarify what width you would like.

Thank You

See forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 120315

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

BEL-88042 - IR-70-19.99

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 10:47:03 AM

Missing quantity for trench for lighting duct cable (ref. 38). There is a trench item for the traffic signal conduit.

Plan sheet 41 show tether wire details for traffic signals. There is no bid item for the tether. Is a tether going to be required? If so, how is it paid for?

Project No. 120316

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

BRO-75450 - SR-32-11.38

Question Submitted: 5/19/2012 3:00:41 PM

Is it possible for the department to post the existing drawings for the structure on the web page so that potential bidders can review the existing drawings??

The existing structure plans may be downloaded at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D09/P%26E/Beekman/BRO-32-1138>.

Project No. 120317

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

BRO-91279 - SR-41-1.80

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 10:37:53 AM

It appears from the borings shown on page 8/17 that the existing asphalt is 3-4' in depth. The proposed pavement section requires a cut of 18" roughly. Will the 304 be placed on existing asphalt? Will the contractor be paid additional for the 304 base if asphalt can not be excavated to exact subgrade elevation. Please advise

304 aggregate base may be placed on existing asphalt. The contractor shall strive to meet subgrade elevations shown in the plans in order to place the proposed pavement section and meet plan quantities.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2012 10:35:26 AM

There is currently no pay item for teh 2,379 LF of W24x162 Steel Beams. Are the steel beams considered incidental or will a pay item be added?

The W24x162 steel beams are paid for under Drilled Shafts, 36" Diameter, above Bedrock, as per plan and Drilled Shafts, 36" Diameter, into Bedrock, as per plan as described in the plans.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2012 1:29:45 PM

Please provide a better description of the soils above rock and depths. Soil borings in drawings are inadequate.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D09/P%26E/Beekman/BRO-41-0180>.

Project No. 120318

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

BRO-81915 - US-52-12.23 (SECOND STREET)

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 1:37:59 PM

Is this completion date correct?(8-31-12) This bid is a rebid and when it bid back in January the completion date was 7-31-12.

Yes. The completion date is 8/31/12.

Project No. 120320

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

BUT-90874 - SR-129-15.96

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 11:20:22 AM

What quantity of 6"x12" fiberglass panels is to be replaced on BUT-129-2316L? Where is this item to be paid?

This question has been answered by addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 10:40:18 AM

Can the existing plans and shop drawings be made available on line?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/BUT-90874>

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 10:39:18 AM

Would the Department consider reducing the prime work percentage to 30%?

This office respectfully declines to reduce the prime work type percentage from 50% to 30%.

Project No. 120321

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

CUY-88600 - IR-90-10.62, PART 1;CUY-71-16.40, PART 2

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 2:48:25 PM

Please clarify the clearing and seeding items on Part 1 of this project. What exactly is the intent of these items since very little disturbance of existing ground will occur since the wall and related items were removed from the bid?

The erosion control quantities are intended to be used throughout the areas disturbed for the vegetative screening installation.

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 12:57:50 PM

Can you please provide soil borings for the project

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID88600/>

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 3:51:44 PM

Part 1 & 2 require PCMS to be on site according to plans notes. The plan notes then say that the contractor will only be paid for the PCMS when they are operating. Please clarify this since there is substantial cost involved just to rent these units even though they are not functioning, but according to plan notes they need to be on site please clarify.

The second question is on part 2 plan page 3/22, shows seeding and mulching as part of the legend. We are asking if there should be bid item for this since there will a considerable amount of disturbance to the work area?

1. The plan notes are correct. Please bid accordingly. 2. Payment for erosion control items is to be included with Item 606 – Special – Noise barrier (Absorptive), as indicated in the Restoration of Work Area note on sheet 4/22.

Project No. 120322

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

COS-85478 - VA-GR-FY2012

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 3:22:39 PM

This project requires substantial work in the median of IR 70 and IR-77. Will lane closures be required during this work or will shoulder work set-ups be sufficient.

Lane closures will be required during the work on I.R. 70 and I.R. 77, as per the permitted lane closure times listed on the Permitted Lane Closures Web Site, 14 calendar Days prior to the bid letting date for this project. See note on plan sheet 3/20.

Project No. 120323

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

COS-92494 - VA-SIGNAL-FY2012

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 3:14:44 PM

Bid reference # 14 is to split existing 2 way heads into separate 1 way heads. Are all the existing 2 way signal heads that are being split comprised of 3-12" signals for each direction or are some heads 4-12" or 5-12"? The hardware to split these items would differ if each location and direction does not consist of all 3-12" signal heads. Can a breakdown by location be provided if these differ by location?

The break down is 21 sets of 3-section signal heads and 1 set of 5-section signal heads to be split under the quantity of Signalization Misc.: split existing 2-way signal heads into 2 separate 1-way signal heads.

Project No. 120324

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

BUT-91825 - VA-SP-FY2012

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 7:56:27 AM

The lane closure policy does not address reducing a 4 lane section down to 1 lane. In order to repair the middle lane line of a 4 lane section, 3 lanes will need to be closed. What hours can a 4 lane section be reduced to 1 lane?

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 7:37:52 AM

On sheet #5 under 614 Maintaining Traffic you state that Phase 1 has to be completed in 30 days and Phase 2 & 3 has to be completed in 30 days. However, the total duration for the project is 120 days. Can the duration of the lane closures be increase because this work will be very difficult to be completed with such tight lane closure durations?

The contractor shall follow the permitted lane closure. The completion Date is being changed in a forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2012 12:59:35 PM

Before the contractor can start work, the MOT must be designed and the department has 14 days to review. Due to the May 24th bid date, one week after that for award, it will be close to July before work can begin. Could the completion date be extended to allow enough time for the contractor to complete the work?

Question Submitted: 5/11/2012 10:40:23 AM

Reference 32 Maintaining traffic as per plan, requires the contractor to include the temporary pavement markings in this lump sum item. In order to calculate the quantity of temporary pavement markings, we need to know where the pavement repair will be in relation to the lane lines and edge lines. What quantity of repair will take place over edge lines? What quantity of repair will take place over lane lines? If this information is not given, the state could be paying for temporary markings the will never be placed.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2012 9:59:42 AM

Plan page 9, under the note for Item "254 - Pavement Planing, asphalt concrete" it states the milling is to be covered with the intermediate course within the first week. A majority of the milling does not get covered with intermediate, only a surface course is applied. When does the pavement planing need to be covered in areas where only surface course is applied.

Project No. 120326

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

ERI-87437 - US-6-27.13

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 3:49:09 PM

Can excavated material from the removal of the existing arch culvert as well as excavated material from the placement of the new 90" pipe be used as embankment material?

Yes, as long as it meets all requirements of item 203 of CMS

Project No. 120327

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

HAM-84480 - US-27-10.04

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 1:53:10 PM

Bid Ref.25, Detector Loop, APP calls for a quantity of 34 detector loops. The APP Note on plan page 6 states the following: The Stop Line Detector Loops Shall Not Be Wired To Any Other Loops And Shall Have Its Own Detector Channel."Additional Loop Detector Units Shall Be Incidental To This Pay Item So That Each Detector Has Its Own Detector Channel". Without any quantity or locations of the proposed stop line loop detectors, it is impossible to determine on the quantity of loop detector units that will be needed. Can ODOT provide the sizes and locations for these proposed loop detectors?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 120328

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

HAM-83964 - IR-74-8.60

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 9:28:26 AM

After visiting the site & studying the access alternatives we have concluded the work area provided by the MOT plans for this project along the existing I-74 west bound outside berm is not adequate to perform the work. Access to the approach slope from below in the stream bed appears unfeasible as no water permits have been obtained. The water is too shallow to utilize floating equipment. The existing slope is too unstable and narrow to bench in access and support large heavy equipment. This leaves access from the top of the slope as the only remaining practical approach. The equipment to perform this work will require a work area at least 23' wide to prevent intrusion into a traffic lane. The plans as shown provide about 8' of width of usable space along much of the work area after the 3 lanes of traffic are shifted. At the very minimum another full lane of traffic needs to be taken for the work area - after the traffic shift. Can the MOT plan be modified to provide this additional work space & reduce the open traffic lanes from 3 to 2 during the slope repair construction phase of the project?

Plan notes on drawings 6 & 7 of 14 call for the existing pavement markings to be covered per CMS 614.11G. According to this CMS section the covering material is to be replaced after no more than 15 days in place. Is it expected by the department that all of these coverings be replaced several times during the entire duration of the work which will last far longer than 15 days?

- 1. The MOT scheme presented in the plans shall be utilized to construct the work.**
- 2. CMS 614.11G shall be followed for the duration of the project.**

Question Submitted: 5/7/2012 12:52:22 PM

Plan sheet 13/14 identifies the sheet piling left in place as both Section Modulus of 48.5 cubic inches per foot of wall and as PZ35. Will other sheeting sections with at least the minimum section modulus be acceptable?

Alternate sheeting sections meeting the minimum section modulus will be permitted. The sheeting section must be capable of being sufficiently driven to the tip elevation specified in the plans.

Project No. 120330

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

HAM-75684 - SR-PPS-FY2012

Question Submitted: 5/10/2012 3:25:15 PM

What are the time restrictions for this project on the mainline?

See the Plan Note for Permitted Lane Closure Times on Sheet 12 of 15. The PLC link is in this note.

Project No. 120331

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

HIG-91166 - SR-41-0.73

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 1:02:54 PM

Please provide soils info for part 2

Question Submitted: 5/10/2012 1:41:14 PM

The boring information in the plans (page 13) are inadequate. There are no depths provided. Also it would be nice to provide a description of the soils as you did with the rock.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D09/P%26E/Beekman/HIG-41-0073>.

Question Submitted: 4/28/2012 4:27:39 PM

There is no phone or cable service for a job trailer in this area. Can a cellphone be used. Must we have two cell phones for the two line requirement? Must the fax machine have a dedicated phone number ?

A cell phone cannot be used. Provide telephone connections according item 619 of the CMS. For each telephone specified, provide the telephone itself, all wiring necessary to connect the phone and computers or fax machines to the phone company system, and a working separate phone number for each telephone. Connect one phone to a recorded answering device.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/28/2012 4:19:13 PM

There is no electric in the area of the project. Can solar traffic signals be used? Can a generator be used for the job trailer?

Portable solar powered signals will be permitted provided they are in compliance with Supplemental Specification 961 and Supplement 1050 as stated in Standard Drawing MT-96.11 dated 1/6/2009. A generator cannot be used for the job trailer.

Project No. 120333

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

LOG-19741 - SR-708-2.08

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 11:44:14 AM

Is every pile in the abutments and piers to be prebored to a depth of 5ft below the sanitary sewer invert? If so, the quantity needs to be increased?

The designer has verified the plan quantity. All of the piles are intended for pre-bore (abutments and piers) giving an estimated quantity of 336 FT as shown in the plans. The estimated quantity is based on available utility information and could vary in the field.

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 11:41:08 AM

There is a "CONSTRUCTION NOISE" note on page 4/26 of the plans not to operate power-operated construction-type equipment between 9 PM and 7 AM. This note will need to be waived to place the concrete deck, which will be placed within these hours.

We will waive this restriction for the deck pour operation.

Project No. 120334

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

MAD-86455 - SR-38-18.09

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 1:38:16 PM

Page 5 of the plans specifies earthwork for maintaining traffic. Which pay item is this covered under? Can the duration for each phase be changed to 60 days? Due to the amount of work and number of concrete pours, 30 days per phase is not feasible.

The cost of the Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic on plan sheet 5 is to be included with the cost of Item 615E25000 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B.

On sheet 5, Paragraph 2, the duration of each phase should be 60 consecutive calendar days, not 30 days.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 7:38:59 AM

On sheet #5 under 614 Maintaining Traffic you state that Phase 1 has to be completed in 30 days and Phase 2 & 3 has to be completed in 30 days. However, the total duration for the project is 120 days. Can the duration of the lane closures be increase because this work will be very difficult to be completed with such tight lane closure durations?

The Department declines to revise the lane closure times. Bid as shown.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2012 1:36:05 PM

Could you please provide the "OFFICE CALCS" for this project?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MAD-86455>

Project No. 120335

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

MAD-84287 - US-40/42-INTERCHANGE (SECOND PROJECT)

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 1:54:31 PM

Will the department allow waste to be disposed of within the project right away, as per 107.11

Bid the plans as proposed.

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 9:14:57 PM

Page 12 list quantities to repair the pavement after installation of the 54" sewer some quantities have been carried forward to the general summary. An addendum needs issued to adjust the pavement quantities that were not carried forward. A pavement sawing bid item should be added for the pavement sawing quantity shown on sheet 12 and also in the typical section

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 7:52:33 AM

Can the office calculations be provided??

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MAD-84287>

Question Submitted: 5/10/2012 11:16:52 AM

Could you provide the Office Calculations for this project?

Project No. 120336

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

MAH-88370 - US-224-20.09

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 1:04:56 PM

Addendum # 1 issued a replacement plan note for the vehicular signal heads that requires signal support hardware including the the wire inlet to be ferrous metal. However, the plans require the signal to be tethered per PIS 208521 which conflicts with this note. The wire outlet that is commercially available for tethering to PIS 208521 is aluminum, a ferrous metal version of this is not available. ODOT supplement specification 800 addresses this in section 732.01. Can an addendum be issued addressing this matter.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 2:13:02 PM

Bid reference # 33 is described as a 16 pair, # 14 interconnect cable in the proposal book. However the As Per Plan note on plan page 4 describes this cable as 6 pair, not 16 pair. Typically, past projects have required a 6 pair cable for such applications not 16 pair. Is 16 pair correct or should this item be 6 pair?

Question Submitted: 5/8/2012 2:04:33 PM

Bid item 15 Center line 1.0 miles. The quantity needs to be changed to 0.08 miles as per plan sheet 6.

Project No. 120337

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

MAR-82372 - US-23-2.42

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 2:45:13 PM

On plan sheet 8/20 the pavement repair detail outlines the use of 448-1 Intermediate as the material used to replace the repair. In the general notes, the repairs are to be performed under the 251 specification which allows for 448-2 or 301 mix to be used as the replacement asphalt mix. Will the department allow the contractor to use 448-2 Intermediate or 301 for these repairs?

ODOT will not allow the use of Item 301 Asphalt Concrete Base or Item 448 Type 2 Intermediate Course Asphalt Concrete in the Partial Depth Pavement Repair. Provide Item 448 Type 1 Intermediate Course material for the partial depth pavement repair.

Our reasoning is that there is only a thin overlay being placed over this material, and a rougher graded material would affect the ride quality of the repair. The Type 1 mix is also being used in other items of work on the project.

Project No. 120339

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

SEN-80033 - SR-19-4.91

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 11:35:21 AM

Can existing bridge plans be made available online?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SEN-80033>

Project No. 120340

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

SEN-80034 - US-23-7.93

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 4:01:38 PM

Are the permanent Edge Line and Center Line striping at the culverts missing bid items?

The district has been to doing the striping on short culvert and bridge projects. Please refer to the note on sheet 3 that mentions this.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 3:49:40 PM

16 x 8 box culvert design on page 46 has the top slab thickness at 13" instead of 12". This is not a standard thickness box forms build. Can this be changed to 12"?

The top depth cannot be reduced because shear becomes a problem with the load rating.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 9:23:31 AM

Who does the detour? There is no item for it, however the plan pg. 5 calls for the contractor to provide it. I submitted this last week did not see it listed.

ODOT will erect the advanced detour signing. The contractor shall erect and maintain the notice of closure signs, road closed signs and last chance barricades as stated in the plans.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 2:20:47 PM

Plan sheet 46 has a detail showing that the box is a 16 x 8. The steel areas listed on the same page are for a 18 x 6. Are the steel areas for the 16 x 8 or 18 x 6? Possible typo on the size?

Please advise.

Sheet 46 was correct with addendum 1 to resolve this conflict.

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 8:24:59 AM

After reviewing the plans for this project that lets on 5-24-12 it appears that there's some confusion and errors on Bridge No. SEN-224-0150. The bid item is calling for a 16x8 box culvert and it shows that but it also calls out a 16x6 on sheet 37/83 and on sheet 46/83 is shows the reinforcing for and 18x6.

Could you please look into this and clarify or point me in the right direction to get this resolved?

Thanks,

Project No. 120343

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

WAY-86725 - SR-57-0.03

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 12:52:24 PM

On page 9/35, 442 19MM Intermediate Type A quantities from SLM 0.03 to SLM 2.20 appear to be understated.

Would you please review.

Project No. 120344

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

WOO-92579 - SR-25-0.59

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 10:25:13 AM

The bid date is May 24, 2012. Allowing 4 weeks for award, contract document processing, and pre-job meeting the earliest start is June 25, 2012. The completion date is August 20, 2012 or just 8 weeks. Bridge plan sheet 31 outlines the proposed work. The work is sequential and does not allow for any overlap of activities. Add to that the specified cure periods (i.e.: abutment concrete 511.17 estimate 3 days, 511.18A parapets 7 day water cure, 512.03E sealer on parapet 10 day air dry after cure, 848.29 overlay 3 day water cure, 511.18A approach slabs 7 day water cure) approximately 3 weeks of the scheduled time will be used for concrete curing. The project cannot be completed by the date specified. Please review and modify the completion date.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 9:43:47 AM

From the MOT plan detour (sheet 5) it appears that Ramp B (IR 75 NB Off Ramp and Grant Road) remains open at all times. The work to be performed on Ramp B shown on sheet 15 includes sawing the existing pavement, removal of the existing curb/median/pavement, replacement of the concrete curb and median and 2' width of full depth asphalt pavement. With its location between 2 lanes and allowing room for construction equipment, this will require closing the ramp to perform the required work and will include concrete cure time. Please review and outline an MOT closure or plan at Ramp B.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 9:33:23 AM

the MOT plan on sheet 5 shows a detour. There is no bid item for Item 614 Detour Signing, therefore the detour is the responsibility of ODOT. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 9:29:07 AM

Ref 69 Pressure Relief Joint, Type a is shown on plan sheet 31 & 32. Per the typical section on plan sheet 3, the new full depth pavement at the approach slab is asphalt. There is no need for a pressure relief joint. Please review.

The district is requiring a pressure relief joint. Bid as shown

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 9:25:37 AM

The General Summary sheet 9 shows "Office Calcs" as the source of information for 17 items of work. Please provide this information.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-92579>

Question Submitted: 4/24/2012 10:17:56 AM

It appears you have duplication of bid items. Ref # 23 Tied concrete block mat, Type 1 as shown on plan page 14 appears to be some of the same as Ref # 93 Tied concrete block mat, Type 2 as shown on page 31 of the bridge site plan. As you see the types of Tied concrete block mat are different and the quantities are different. The quantity of 120 sy. for the type 2 in Ref # 93 doesn't add up to the Sum of D-1 thru D-4 on page 11 in the drainage "D" table

Project No. 120346

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

AUG-87870 - VA-TSG LOOP-FY2012/FY2013

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 5:58:29 PM

Bid reference #13, Advance / Dilemma Zone detection has an as per plan note on page 4 that requires one sensor to be provided for each approach. However, the plans do not indicate what location that these will be installed at or define how many approaches that are at that location? How many sensors are required for each system of this item?

There are 4 approaches, location is the intersection of SR 274 / SR 235.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 12:27:04 PM

How many cameras are to be provided with each Video Detection System, Item 14?

For information only, 4 cameras.

Project No. 120351

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

TRU-89340 - SR-46-(0.49)(0.77)

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 11:05:26 AM

The completion date for this project is listed as 11/16/12. However, a plan note on page 2 states an interim completion date of August 31. Which is correct? Please keep in mind that current lead times for poles and other signal material will not support an August completion date.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 5:30:02 PM

The As Per Plan note on page 3 of the plan sets requires the signal support hardware including the wire outlet to be ferrous metal. However, the signals are to be tethered on the span per PIS 208521 & 208522 with an adjustable wire outlet which is aluminum. This style of wire outlet hardware is not available in a ferrous metal. ODOT supplemental Specification 800 addresses this in section 732.01 where tether signals are to have an aluminum wire outlet. Can an addendum be issued to address this matter.

Project No. 120358

Sale Date - 6/7/2012

COL-84266 - SR-344-8.19

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 10:19:14 AM

Bearing stiffeners are not shown on the beam details on sheets 75/84 or 77/84. May we infer they are not required at abutments or piers on this project?

No stiffeners are required.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/9/2012 1:33:44 PM

Could ODOT please post the drawings for the existing bridge drawings for the above referenced project at your earliest convenience.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/84266/>

Question Submitted: 5/5/2012 2:26:08 PM

Per proposal note PN 555, Surface Smoothness for Bridges and Approaches, please immediately post a link to the website that lists the certified profilers.

http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Planning/TechServ/prod_services/Pages/RideQuality.aspx

Question Submitted: 5/5/2012 2:14:57 PM

Please post a link as soon as possible with the roadway and structure office calculations.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/84266/>

Question Submitted: 5/5/2012 2:12:34 PM

Please post a link as soon as possible for the existing bridge plans.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/84266/>

Project No. 120372

Sale Date - 6/7/2012

HAM-83077 - IR-71-15.78

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 8:03:07 AM

Please provide the office calcs for this project?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAM-83077>

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 8:34:59 AM

Bid item 23 Truncated Domes: the quantity needs to be changed from EACH to SQUARE FEET, as per sheet 46 of the plans.

Project No. 120379

Sale Date - 6/7/2012

MAH-25292 - SR-165-(17.29)(19.24)

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:31:38 PM

Please be advised that three questions were submitted on May 5 that were not responded to.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/Mah-165-17-29pid25292/>

Question Submitted: 5/5/2012 2:19:46 PM

Please post online a link to the roadway office calculations.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/Mah-165-17-29pid25292/>

Question Submitted: 5/5/2012 2:17:55 PM

Please post a link as soon as possible with the structure office calculations.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/Mah-165-17-29pid25292/>

Question Submitted: 5/5/2012 2:16:21 PM

Please post a link as soon as possible with the existing plans.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 120382

Sale Date - 6/7/2012

MUS-80762 - CR-C.R.696-0.12

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 3:47:13 PM

On sheet 19 of 39 under , Item Special, Structure, Misc.: Plaques, it is stated that the contractor shall provide a total lump sum amount of \$5,000.00 for the two plaques. The CMS file does not reflect this \$5,000.00 allowance for ref. #76. Please correct the CMS file or provide clarification.

Project No. 120393

Sale Date - 6/7/2012

HIG-83017 - SR-321-(2.17)(3.97)

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 7:00:52 AM

The estimated quantities for HIG-321-2.17 on plan sheet 27/50 and the estimated quantities for HIG-321-3.97 on plan sheet 36/50 include 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F (707.45) for abutments. Where is this shown on the plans? What is it used for?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 2:00:29 PM

Will the existing structure plans be available on line?

[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D09/P%26E/Hauck/HIG-321-\(2.17\)\(3.97\)-83017/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D09/P%26E/Hauck/HIG-321-(2.17)(3.97)-83017/)

Project No. 120394

Sale Date - 6/7/2012

LUC-90650 - LR-PUMP STATIONS

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 1:50:42 PM

I need to see inside the pump station buildings. How can I arrange a site visit with someone that can open them up to access for viewing?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 3:00:50 PM

1. For bypass pumping at the Woodville Pump Station it requires 10 CFS. Is this flow constant or sporadic?
2. For bypass pumping at Manhattan Pump Station there is no rate of flow given. What would the flow rate be here? Is it Constant or sporadic?
3. In the specifications for the Sluice Gates there are no manufacturers named. Are there any suggested manufacturers for the Sluice Gates?
4. For replacement of the Gate at Starr Ave Pump Station it call for a flange mounted sluice Gate. Is there a flange currently on the inlet pipe or will we need to provide one?

Project No. 123004

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

DEL-86921 - IR/MRW-71-11.50/0.00

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 5:11:12 PM

Addendum #3 requires the structural lining at MRW-1-0092 to be either liner pipe or spiral lining. No pipe sizes fit geometrically inside the existing 18" corner pipe arch and meet the hydraulic requirements. This would require the use of the spiral lining. Due to the very high cost of the spiral lining, and could the scope be changed to allow for complete replacement?

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 8:01:43 AM

The culvert inspection report in attachment G identifies many of the culvert streams as abrasive. This greatly limits the use of certain pipe materials and eliminates some options depending on pH. Will ODOT require the pipe material for these culverts to be based on abrasive or nonabrasive conditions?

The DBT shall determine if flow conditions are abrasive or non-abrasive based upon the criteria outlined in the L&D Vol. 2. If abrasive conditions are present, the DBT shall provide conduit material meeting the requirements in L&D Vol. 2.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 3:09:08 PM

Will ODOT allow a concrete plant to be erected on the right-of-way of the project?

Reference CMS 107.11B & C.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 3:01:24 PM

1. The Drainage Scope of Work in Attachment G provides the required drainage improvements for the project. For structure MRW-71-0092, the 'Proposed Work' column indicates that the structure is to receive a "Structural Lining". Which of the Culvert Rehabilitation techniques described in the L&D, Volume 2 Section 1002.3.7 satisfy this structural lining requirement?
2. Would ODOT consider revising the Drainage Scope of Work to allow for structural lining of the culverts listed below in lieu of replacement?

DEL-71-1472

DEL-71-1610

DEL-71-1716

3. If the culverts listed above are lined or another process is used can the head walls be salvaged and not replaced?

Structural Lining of culverts shall consist of the methods in SS 837, SS 841, SS 937 and SS 938. ODOT will not revise the scope of work for the DEL-71-14.72, DEL-71-16.10 and DEL-71-17.16 culverts.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 2:13:21 PM

Can the existing Overhead Sign Structures for the Signs to taper down to two lanes noted for re-installation under section 16.2 be relocated at the north limits of the project, or will new Overhead Sign Structures be required?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:50:21 AM

Will the current contract MRW 61-1.29 for reconstruction the SR61 bridge for over I-71 be providing pier protection? The proposed plans did not show piers protection, with D-walls or guardrail, until the mainline project under construction.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:48:57 AM

After reviewing the Boring Logs and GB1 Subgrade Analysis by ODOT (Attachment by ODOT) the soil data (SPT, Moisture Contents, gradation and soil description), and the stationing/offsets do not match? The discrepancy is not isolated but common with the majority, actually every boring I checked (about 6 or 8) with the exception of one there was discrepancies. My concern is that I may not be using the representative soil data of the site, please advise which is correct the GB1 or the Logs?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:47:02 AM

The typical sections for the Preliminary Engineering Plans show ODOT Item 605 - 6" Base Pipe Underdrains at the edge of pavement and edge of shoulders. According to the ODOT drainage manual, for dual underdrain systems with shoulders 8' wide or more the shoulder underdrain is a Base Pipe underdrain at 18" depth and is supplemental to the edge of pavement underdrain. The manual does not clarify but it is implied the underdrain at the edge of pavement is a Shallow Pipe underdrain with a depth typically 30". This has previously been the case on similar projects with this type of roadway section and pavement width. Also, with the latest version of the ODOT drainage manual, if dual underdrains are used, the edge of pavement underdrain is not required on high side. Underdrains are not addressed in the Scope other than Section 14.5 saying to use 6" pipe wrapped in fabric and outletting the median underdrains to the catch basins. The question is: Does ODOT District 06 prefer is to use all Base Pipe underdrains or should the edge of pavement underdrain be a Shallow Pipe underdrain as per the drainage manual?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:45:22 AM

Will existing Guide Sign Panels (which are being placed on new cantilever structures) need to be upgraded to latest MUTCD standards, or can the existing Sign Panels be utilized and relocated?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 8:36:20 AM

1. Will Asphalt Paving be required underneath Guardrail for this project as per sample plan note R116 (as shown in the L&D manual Vol. 1)? If not what will be required under the guardrail if anything?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 3:18:00 PM

Proposal page 17 requires the DBT to provide "Electronic Instrumentation". The second paragraph states "Provide equipment, software and all three dimensional models needed to verify layout..." Is the equipment referring to a computer? Is the software referring to CADD or Microstation? Will 2 computers and 2 versions of the software be required? Will the engineer being trained have any previous experience with the software? If so, how much? We will need this information to determine how much training time to put in the bid.

The intent of the electronic instrumentation requirement is to provide the ODOT field personnel the means to verify as built conditions. The DBT shall provide two data collector/receiver units. If the receiver/data collector units can be managed/supported from one personal computer, then the DBT only needs to provide one PC and supporting software package. ODOT prefers the use of the Microstation/Geopak CADD software package, but will not reject any software package meeting the requirements of the Survey and Mapping Specifications and the ODOT CADD Engineering Standards Manual. Assume that the ODOT engineers have no experience with the software package or hardware, but are familiar with the general principles of surveying. ODOT's expectation for the training is to familiarize their personnel with the specific hardware and software provided by the DBT, and to provide ongoing technical support for the life of the contract.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 8:11:00 AM

Will the Performance and Payment bond required for this project be on the form used for Design/Build Projects? Do you have a copy of the Performance and Payment Bond form required for this project and can you make it available?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/DEL-86921>

Question Submitted: 5/14/2012 2:02:40 PM

When we click on the link to the prebid transcript for 123004, the transcript for 123003 comes up.

Please advise.

The Pre-bid meeting transcript has been replaced with the transcript from the DEL-71-11.50, PID 86921 project meeting held on 5/2/12. The transcript from a different meeting was previously posted.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2012 3:18:40 PM

We believe the 7% DBE goal on this project is extremely high. A large percentage of this project is the paving, which will necessarily have to be performed by the prime contractor. This does not leave many significant subcontracting opportunities for DBEs or any other subcontractors. Normally bridge work is an area where significant participation can be obtained, however, the lack of any major bridge work in this contract substantially reduces the potential. In addition, DBE trucks are difficult to obtain now due to several other major projects in the central Ohio area. Please lower the goal for this project.

ODOT will not revise the DBE goal for the project.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

5/10/2012 4:54:35 PM

This job requires the pipe be installed per SS 802 instead of 603/604.

1. 802.04.C states, "Perform work only in the presence of the Contractor's representative doing the inspection." 802.06 states, "Ensure compaction density complies with the installation plan by performing compaction testing according to Supplement 1015 and the manufacturer's recommendation." What is the intent of the "Contractor's representative"? Is it ODOT's intent that the contractor hire a third party inspection and testing firm or can this be an employee of the contractor?
2. 802.12 – The note states, "Conduct a performance survey to verify that the elevation and location of each Type B and C conduit and drainage structure is within the tolerances listed in 802.14. Conduct a performance survey to verify that the elevation and location of each Type A conduit matches the plan." Is this in addition to performing the manual and remote inspection of the conduits? Can this work be performed by the Contractor?
3. 802.12 – The note states, "Conduits with a rise of 36" and greater – Manual inspection. Conduits with a rise of 12 inches or greater up to 48 inches – Remote Inspection." There seems to be an overlap in sizes 36" to 48". Will these sizes be manual or remote inspection?
4. 802.13 – The note states, "Have an independent Registered Engineer evaluate the conduit and any defects as required." Is the independent Engineer required to evaluate all conduit or just conduit that has been identified as defective?

The "contractor's representative" referenced in SS 802.04C is the contractor's employee that is generating the inspection documentation forms (CA P1 and 3).

The performance survey referenced in SS 802.12 is intended to set the Horizontal & Vertical standard for plan alignment of the pipe. This survey is not part of the independent PE report, and may be performed by the DBT's personnel.

Pipes sized 36" to 48" may be inspected manually or by remote, at the DBT's option.

The independent engineer required by SS 802.13 is required to evaluate all conduit, locating any defects per the specification. The independent engineer must then also evaluate any defects to determine the appropriate remediation effort.

Question Submitted:

5/10/2012 3:18:27 PM

Addendum 2 removed the pothole patching bid item and changed the language in Section 8.2 to place responsibility for maintenance of the existing pavement on the DBT. By including existing travel lanes, this revision places a tremendous amount of risk on the DBT for an item which we have no control over. Is the intent that the contractor assumes this risk for the entire direction of travel even if no work has been started in a physical portion of the project (i.e. are we responsible for the entire limits from DEL-71-11.50 thru MRW-71-3.17 as soon as any work is started in a single location on the project)? How does the Department reasonably expect the contractor to price this work? Please revise this note to place project risk with the party better suited to manage the risk, which in this case is the Department.

ODOT deleted the pothole patching item in order to eliminate any conflict in the responsibility for maintaining the existing pavement during the contract, per the provisions of CMS 614.02. ODOT has provided quantities of partial depth repair for known areas where the existing pavement is deteriorated. Reference section 8.2 of the scope for the criteria governing maintenance responsibility on the roadway. ODOT believes that the DBTs have sufficient information to bid the work accordingly.

Question Submitted:

5/10/2012 10:51:09 AM

With Addendum 2 received today and the answer to question 31 furnished will ODOT extend the bid date 2-3 weeks to allow for the time to process additional sulfate testing? The contractor cannot receive a permit, dig the amount of test hole that are going to be required and get the material to a lab and processed in 14 days. There is not enough subsurface information done by ODOT for the contractor to price the global stabilization.

Project Sale will not be delayed due to this issue. Department has provided consistent feedback on this issue throughout bidding process

Question Submitted:

5/8/2012 1:55:42 PM

RE: Overhead Sign Supports

The existing interchange signs (1 Mile, ½ Mile, and Exit Signs) for the SR-61 Interchange are all on Ground Mounted Beam supports located with the left edge of the sign 30 ft from the existing edge of pavement. Current design standards do not indicate that these signs would need to be replaced. Attachment J states that the signs are to be removed and re-erected on new cantilevers; however Attachment J is "For Reference" rather than a "Contractual Requirement". Will ODOT require the DBT to remove and re-erect the signs on new cantilevers as stated in Attachment J?

The existing interchange guide signs are to be removed and re-erected on overhead supports. This is a contractual requirement.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/8/2012 1:27:08 PM

Does the Consultants information need to be submitted before the bid? If so, is it submitted electronically?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/8/2012 8:32:50 AM

The proposal scope section 14.3 Pavement, states: No longitudinal joints will be allowed in the middle of a travel lane for concrete pavement. Will the department reconsider this note with the submittal of stress analysis data to the office pavements and by addressing all other concerns of the district, central office and FHWA?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/8/2012 7:50:05 AM

The Index of Attachments in Addendum #1 changed the "Culvert Scope" in attachment G to contractual and attachment H to "for reference". Section 14.5 still includes attachment H as the scope of work. Please revise.

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/4/2012 4:58:32 PM

RE: Existing Crack and Seat Pavement

The current ODOT C&MS states that the when performing cracking and seating of existing non-reinforced concrete pavement that the pavement is to be cracked into nominal 4 x 4 – foot segments. Can ODOT provide the pattern used during the performance of the cracking and seating operation of the original 10” T-71 reinforced concrete pavement on this project?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/4/2012 4:56:13 PM

RE: Pavement Removal

A review of the existing pavement structure throughout the project indicates that many areas of the existing IR-71 pavement contain a layer of existing 10” T-71 reinforced concrete that has been cracked and seated. What type of reinforcement does the existing pavement contain; wire mesh, rebar matting; continuous reinforcing bars...etc? It is important for the contractor to know this information because the cost of removal can vary widely depending on the type of reinforcement.

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/4/2012 4:40:58 PM

RE: Subgrade Stabilization

In comparison to project 113006 MRW-71-12.19, ODOT has provided significantly less boring information for this project. In order to develop an adequate subgrade stabilization plan, we believe that more boring information needs to be provided. Rather than each DBT performing its own additional borings, will ODOT consider performing additional borings on the project and providing the information to all of the DBTs?

Additionally, given the limited borings available for the project, the GB1 analysis indicates that the vast majority of the subgrade will require stabilization. Would ODOT please consider adding contingency items for stabilization or possibly adding global stabilization to the project?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 4:32:22 PM

Upon project completion, will this project be opened to 2 lanes or 3 lanes?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 4:32:01 PM

What are the limits of full width permanent pavement construction at the north end of the project? The sample plans in Attachment A show a transition from 3 lanes to 2 lanes within the project limits. Is this how the DBT is to construct the project?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 4:31:40 PM

What is the design speed for Crall Road?

See Addendum B

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 9:32:23 AM

Should the date for no storage of equipment or materials in the ROW in Section 13.6.3 be changed to October 31 to correspond with the interim completion dates?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 9:25:20 AM

The description for Item Special – Maintaining Traffic in Section 8.2 states that this item includes ‘maintenance of existing pavement within the work limits’. This is contradictory to Sections 13.1.1 and 13.1.2 which establish unit pricing for maintaining the pavement within the work zone. Should the language in Section 8.2 be removed?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/3/2012 8:47:45 AM

Scope Section 13.1.2 currently only references pothole patching. This language should be expanded to include any pavement repairs required during construction. Will the Department pay for all pavement repairs within the maintenance of traffic work zone under the Asphalt Concrete for Maintaining Traffic biditem?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/2/2012 3:10:17 PM

1. Table G – Drainage Scope of Work includes field tiles that are beyond the construction and right of way limits. Has ODOT obtained the proper easements to perform this work?
2. The field tile collectors that run under the pavement were installed prior to the embankment. In order to replace these per attachment G, we would have to excavate up to 15 ft deep under the pavement. For cost and constructability, could all field tile work be removed from the scope?

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/2/2012 3:07:54 PM

Attachment G – Drainage Scope of Work is now the contractual scope for all of the drainage. Under “Proposed Work” the majority of the work is “Replace”. Please confirm that this applies to the pipe as well as the drainage structure.

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 5/2/2012 3:00:30 PM

On the current ODOT project 0454(11), the contractor is allowed to close all 4 ramps at the same time for a maximum of 15 calendar days per the Maintenance of Traffic notes on sheet 20/225. Will the department allow that same note for this project in order to construct the ramps? By doing so it would reduce the cost to the department by not needing temporary pavement to build the ramps part-width.

See Addendum B

Question Submitted: 4/30/2012 2:13:46 PM

The interim completion date table in scope reference 6 shows MRW-71-2.54 to 3.71 to be completed by 10/31/12. In Scope section 19 it is stated MRW-71-2.54 to 3.71 is to be completed by 10/1/13. Does this work need to be completed in 2012 as stated in the table or 2013 as stated in section 19?

The Interim Completion Date for the completion of MWR-71-2.54 to 3.17 is to be 10/31/13. The scope document will be updated accordingly in upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2012 4:08:39 PM

Is the table for removal of conflicting markings in 614.11.G.1.a on page 478 of the CMS to be used for this project?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/23/2012 8:50:25 AM

The proposed roadway basemap posted on the FTP site appears to be incorrect. Based on the Project index downloaded for the job the roadway basemap should be “86921BP001” and the file that ODOT has for download is “86920BP001”. Please publish appropriate map.

See Addendum A

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/20/2012 2:07:22 PM

What clear zone offsets are we to use at Crall Road? The existing Crall Road is 18' wide. From Location and Design Manual 301-2, Crall Road would be a Local Road with a maximum speed of 45 mph and ADT less than 400. Clear zone for this classification is 8 ft. This also classifies Crall Road as a very low volume roadway, so clear zone offsets can be per engineering judgment per the AASHTO Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT<400). This states that clear zone should try to be obtained, but it may not be cost effective. If not cost effective, clear zone should be evaluated with a preferred minimum of 6 ft provided if possible.

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/20/2012 8:19:25 AM

What design criteria is to be used for Crall Road? Is the 'future typical section' as shown in the preliminary engineering report (Attachment F) to be used as a requirement for setting horizontal clearances?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/20/2012 8:15:45 AM

There is no mention of roadside barriers in the project scope. The future project that rebuilds the overhead bridges may need to remove and replace any barriers that protect the existing piers. Will the contractor on Project 123004 be required to replace this existing barrier even though it may be removed again in the overhead bridge contract?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/19/2012 9:59:53 AM

What is the requirement for biditem 10 - As-Built Construction Plans?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/19/2012 9:59:38 AM

Can you please clarify what is to be included in bid items 12-15? What is the difference between Preliminary Design and Preliminary Plans for Design Build, and Final Design and Final Plans for Design Build?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/16/2012 9:48:45 AM

are the shoulder cores taken by ODOT available for inspection?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:14:02 PM

Under Basis of Payment in Scope Section 8.2, the Construction Erosion Control Item states that this item shall include 4" of top soil within the earth disturbed area for growth of the construction seeding and mulching. Is the contractor required to place topsoil specifically for temporary seeding? If so, what unit price has been established in relation to payment under the allowance item for SS832?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:13:47 PM

Under Basis of Payment in Scope Section 8.2, the Roadway Item states that it includes erosion control (including final top soil). No other parts of the scope require topsoil for the project. What are the requirements regarding topsoil?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:13:31 PM

Section 13.9 states that positive separation (i.e. cable barrier) of opposing directions of traffic within 60' of each other shall be provided. This note is titled Winter Time Limitations.

a. Is the contractor required to place positive separation (i.e. cable barrier) between opposing directions of temporary traffic during the construction season if they are within 60' of each other?

b. No cable barrier is scoped for the northern 6,400' of the project. Since the median width is scoped at 58', will the contractor be required to provide positive separation in this area and if so how is the positive separation to be provided in this section?

See Addendum A

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:13:05 PM

Regarding the note in Section 19 that requires the DBT to complete full width, both directions from MRW-71-0.00 to 3.17 by October 1, 2013:

- a. It appears the intent of this note is to avoid conflicts with the next project to the north. Instead of constructing 3.17 miles by the interim date, can the required construction length be reduced to a more appropriate length that is actually required to transition MOT from this project to the next?
- b. If asphalt pavement is used, does the final surface course need to be completed for the entire length of the required work or can it be completed at the end of the project after the contractor is finished with all MOT phases?
- c. Is permanent striping exempt from the interim completion date as part of this section may be required to perform traffic shifts in the following construction season?
- d. Scope Section 13.8.1 regarding the MOT on Crall Road allows for 90 day closures in each construction season. Since this bridge lies in the 2013 required work area, what is the intent of allowing Crall Road to be closed in 2014?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:12:10 PM

Scope Section 19 – Buildable Units contains a note that requires the northernmost 3.17 miles of the project to be completed by October 1, 2013. A note of this magnitude would be better placed in Section 13.9 with the other interim completion dates rather than at the back of the Scope. Will the Department move this note to a more prominent place in the scope?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:11:44 PM

Scope Section 14.5 for Drainage states that culverts are to be replaced or rehabilitated in accordance to the scope of work contained in Attachment H. Scope Section 20 states that the reference attachments are provided for informational purposes and do not represent requirements binding on the Design-Builder. These two sections appear to contradict each other regarding the scope of the culvert work. Is the contractor required to perform the Proposed Work noted on the culvert replacement plan sheets in Attachment H, Task No-1.pdf?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:11:21 PM

PN607 for Fence refers to specific biditems. Should this note be revised since the fence is included in Item Special – Misc Roadway?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:11:07 PM

Is formal partnering going to be required or requested by the Department?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:10:54 PM

As currently scoped, the contractors are to include subgrade stabilization in the Roadway Lump Sum biditem. The quantity included is going to be based on the contractor's analysis of the available geotech data and subgrade report. This may cause serious issues on the project if ODOT personnel do not agree with the contractor's analysis and request more stabilization than the contractor included in his bid. Conversely, if the contractor includes more stabilization in his bid than is actually performed, then ODOT will be paying for work that was never completed. The risk of the actual amount of subgrade stabilization performed on the project is better handled by the owner, since the project will ultimately be handed over to them for long term maintenance. It would be best to place control of the amount of stabilization performed in the hands of ODOT rather than the contractor. For these reasons, will ODOT add a biditem to pay for subgrade stabilization on a unit cost basis?

See Addendum A

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:10:36 PM

The median width is specified to be 58', which is inconsistent with the previous project to the north. Additionally, per scope there is no cable rail required for the north mile of the project. This section will not meet design criteria. Is a design exception being granted for this section? If the Department elects to change the required median width, we request that this change be made no later than 4 weeks prior to the bid since a change of this magnitude affects all aspects of the prebid design. Later notification would not allow the contractors enough time to adequately account for the change in our bid.

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/12/2012 2:10:12 PM

Will the contractor be allowed to perform nightly lane/shoulder closures during off-peak hours per Section 13.7.1 from October 1 to April 1?

See Addendum A

Question Submitted: 4/10/2012 11:35:20 AM

- Attachment H has some very extensive work to be completed on 8 existing culverts including replacement of 6. When comparing the invert elevations to the Culvert Inspection Report in attachment G, they do not match. Will the culverts be set to the invert elevations shown in attachment H or the report in attachment G?
- Culvert DEL-71-1716 at 299+04: attachment H shows this culvert as 9'-6"x6'-0"; the culvert inspection report in attachment G shows this culvert as 9'-6"x6'-8"; and, the plan and profile in attachment F shows this culvert as 9'-6"x6'-5". Which is correct?
- Culvert DEL-71-1716 at 299+04: attachment H has a length of 214' and the culvert inspection report in attachment G has a length of 264'. Which is correct?
- The first three culvert replacements in attachment H require the contractor to replace the culverts "in kind". Please define "in kind" as it pertains to these culverts.
- The other three culvert replacements in attachment H are RCP. Will RCP be required for the proposed pipe or will any material that is allowed as type A conduit be allowed?

See Addendum A

Project No. 127001

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

CUY-25621 - IR-480-18.42

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 4:34:04 PM

It appears there is not enough room for equipment or vehicles in phase 2. The work area with the barrier is only 7' wide. How is the contractor to access the work for parapet removals and replacement, fence removals, installing vandal fence, and joint repairs?

Per the plans, the contractor is able to use the permitted lane closure times.

Question Submitted: 5/23/2012 4:08:09 PM

What are the temporary lane closure permitted for Phase 1A and Phase 2A?

Per the plans, temporary lane closes shall be in accordance with the permitted lane closure policy which can be located using the following link: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/districts/D12/HighwayManagement/Pages/PermittedLaneClosures.aspx>

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 12:03:17 PM

On plan sheet 5, under the topic Worksite Traffic Supervisor, the estimated quantity is 4 months. On plan sheet 40, general summary, grand total quantity and proposal quantity is 9 months. Which is correct ?

The bid quantity in the proposal is correct.

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 11:58:58 AM

On plan sheet 4, under the topic of Portable Changeable Message Signs, as per plan, the payment quantity is 240 days. On plan sheet 40, the general summary grand total quantity and proposal quantity is 540 days. Which is correct ?

The bid quantity in the proposal is correct.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 5:05:17 PM

Will it be required to double cut the pavement at the pavement removal limits to prevent spalling of the adjacent pavement? Can a bid item for pavement sawing be added?

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 3:37:25 PM

How many Watch For Stopped Traffic signs with LED lights are required for this project? Also, are these signs portable or stationary?

At a minimum, one sign in each direction is required per standard drawing MT-95.50; however, note 4A on the standard drawing includes additional signs as determined by the engineer. Portable signs are sufficient.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 11:15:29 AM

Bid reference # 3 is for A15B40 light poles. Typically these are supplied with anchor bolts. However, it would appear that the light poles that are being removed are to have the foundations reused. Is that correct? If so, what is the current anchor bolt circle and anchor bolt diameter of the existing poles that are being removed or are these mounted on transformer bases that are being reused?

Correct, the existing foundations and anchors shall be reused. The existing bolt circle and bolt diameters are shown in the original plans (which are posted on the ftp site) and shall be field verified prior to ordering materials.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 8:50:05 AM

The subdeck repairs must be done prior to performing the phase 1 work in spans 8 and 9 per the notes. It is questionable if the subdeck repairs can be done by the 9-15-12 interim completion date, let alone to complete the phase 1 work above it.

The interim completion date has been revised to 11/15/2012. An addendum will be submitted to address this Prebid question

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 8:08:41 AM

there does not appear to be time to perform the subdeck work, there are approximately 30,000 hole to be drilled and bolts to be installed. If an alternate method for access which does not affect traffic can the sub deck work time frame be extended.

The interim completion date has been revised to 11/15/2012. An addendum will be submitted to address this Prebid question

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 10:19:30 AM

Plan sheet 3 WORK LIMITATIONS, can the requirement of completing phase 1 and the subdeck by September 15, 2012 be removed? This would allow the contractors to have more flexibility with their means and methods.

This requirement cannot be removed. All subdecking and Phase 1 work shall be completed by 9/15/12.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 10:12:57 AM

The fence replacement note on plan sheet 52 specifies the quantity of fence posts and rails to be replaced plus a contingency. Do these quantities include the posts and rails at the parapet repairs?

Posts that are in good condition shall be reused. The contingency quantities account for any additional posts that may need replaced, as determined by the Engineer.

Question Submitted: 5/16/2012 4:41:17 PM

sheet 55/81 plates A, B & C hole sizes are shown as 7/16 x 11/64 dia. hole for a 5/8 dia. bolt. Please clarify

The hole diameter should be 11/16" for the 5/8" diameter bolts. Manufacture specifications shall dictate the hold diameter for the blind bolts. An addendum will be issued to address this Prebid question.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 5:10:46 PM

Item 519 patching concrete structures, app, is the intent on the bridge parapet patching just to patch the traffic side of the parapet or is it also for the outside?

The plan intent is to patch the traffic face and top of the parapet. An addendum will be issued to provide this clarification.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 2:20:56 PM

Sheet 54/81 note 2 states All existing and new subdecking panels shall be connected to the structure per the details on sheets 7 & 8. Question are all existing pans to be drilled and bolted as shown on the details?

All existing and new subdecking shall be drilled and bolted as shown in the details.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 2:10:43 PM

Can we view or receive a CD of the existing structure drawings?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-25621>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 128013

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

ASD-80194 - US-250-17.73

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 7:23:49 PM

Supplemental Specification 847 (October 11, 2011), section 847.20, outlines the strict requirements pertaining to the containment, testing, and disposal of the wastewater generated during the waterblasting of the deck prior to placing the overlay. The requirements listed in 847.20 are very prescriptive, and thus, very expensive. The contractor wishes to verify that it is the Department's intent to follow all requirements outlined in 847.20. Please advise so that all contractors may be aware of these requirements and prepare their respective bids accordingly.

SS847 was specified and intended to be followed.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 4:25:43 PM

Bid Reference # 36 is to remove and replace a pull box. The type / specification of pull box is not defined in the plan set. What type of pull box currently exists that will be replaced?

Existing pull boxes are 18" concrete. They shall be replaced in-kind.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 9:08:39 AM

ON BRIDGE 250-1803 THE BACKS OF THE PARAPETS HAVE BEEN SEALED WITH EPOXY-URETHANE THEIR IS NO REMOVAL ITEM

There is significant removal of parts or all of the existing concrete parapets. Parapets are to be refaced or replaced, and sealed.

This project did not include Proposal Note 552 nor any pay item for removal of existing coatings from parapets.

The remaining surfaces of the existing parapets shall be prepared and sealed as part of Item 512 – Sealing of Concrete Surfaces.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2012 9:03:34 AM

ON BRIDGE ASH 250-1790 THEIR IS MENTION OF INTERMEDIATE CROSSFRAMES BUT JUST A BID ITEM FOR END CROSSFRAMES OR ARE THEIR NO INTERMEDIATE BEING USED?

Sheet 59 has the pay item for Item 513 – Structural Steel, Misc.: End Crossframes, Crossframes.

This item covers both end crossframes AND intermediate crossframes.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 10:29:01 AM

In phase 1, the median is to be replaced per the typical sections. The top of the 8" 301 base is shown to match the bottom of the type 2 asphalt. Note that there is milling and resurfacing (3.25") called for in phase 4. Is the contractor supposed to install the 301 asphalt back to original grade and then mill it off in phase 4? If so, will this mean we actually install 11.25" of 301 in the median and get paid accordingly? If so, please revise the quantity of the 301 bid item to reflect this situation.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ASD-80194>

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 3:48:29 PM

Plan sheet 99 has a note stating that "existing aluminum tube railing to be removed". Plan sheet 100 has a note stating "existing aluminum tube railing (to remain)". Please verify in an addendum which note prevails since the railing signage plans were done by a different consultant than the bridge drawings.

See addendum #2.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 3:45:26 PM

Plan sheet 94 gives limits of clearing for the IR 71 bridge only relating to the railing. Since this part of the plans was done by a different consultant than that of the roadway plans (refer to limits of construction shown on sheets 32-34 and note on plan sheet 6 clearing), please verify in an addendum what the limits of clearing are for all bridges.

See addendum #2.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 3:33:10 PM

Plan sheet 6 Clearing and Grubbing note states that there are no trees and stumps specifically marked for removal within the limits of the project. Plan sheets 32-34 show construction limits to barely outside the pavement and/or parapet. All three bridges have painting items which require access to get below the structures. From a site visit, all slopes have significant clearing required to get access to below said structures. Please verify if any tree removal is required and revise plan notes accordingly.

See addendum #2.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/17/2012 10:27:25 AM

There are four rows of mechanical splices in the proposed deck for Bridge 1790 as shown on sheet 65/101. These splicers attach to the S603 and S701 bars, but are not mentioned in the reinforcing schedule on sheet 68/101. Are these mechanical splices to be considered incidental to Reference No. 0074 Epoxy Resteel?

Per CMS 509.11 the mechanical connectors indicated in the plans are incidental to the price bid for Item 509 reinforcing steel.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 2:55:23 PM

The general summary shows several quantities as per "office calcs". Please provide office calculations for the contractor's use in bidding this project.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ASD-80194>

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 10:18:53 AM

Please post the existing bridge and roadway drawings to an FTP site. Thank you.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/districts/D03/80194>

Question Submitted: 5/15/2012 10:10:03 AM

Plan sheet 7, stage 4 sequence of construction calls for milling and installation of surface course. Plan sheets 3-5 call for two lifts of asphalt. Is the stage 4 note for end transitions only or is it for the entire project (does the stage 4 plan note need to be revised?)?

Question Submitted: 5/14/2012 4:20:36 PM

Ref. 13- Full Depth Pavement Sawing, typical sections on plan sheets 3-5 do not give existing pavement composition. Please provide pavement composition information so we can provide it to our sawcutting subcontractors.

Pavement cores were not taken in the project area, and no past records are available.

Please refer to existing plans of the project area that have been made available.

No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2012 2:30:16 PM

Bid item 171- Field Office, Type B has a quantity of 9 months. The completion date is November 15, 2012. Please verify if this owner quantity is correct.

Project No. 128015

Sale Date - 5/24/2012

LAK-92652 - SR-2-3.33/VAR

Question Submitted: 5/22/2012 9:40:31 AM

Will it be required to double cut the pavement at the pavement removal limits to prevent spalling of the adjacent pavement? Can a bid item for pavement sawing be added?

Saw cutting is to be included with Item 452 – Non-reinforced Concrete Pavement, Misc., see sheet 12/29. Double saw cutting would be a contractors means and methods preference and is not required.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 2:46:46 PM

Proposal ref.9 depicts item 452 Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement, Misc.:11.5", Class MS. Standard Drawing BP-2.5 dated 7/18/08 listed on the plan cover sheet states reinforcement will be required for all repairs greater than 10ft in length. All repairs on the summary are greater than 10ft. Please advise if ODOT will require wire mesh in all repairs. This conflicts with CMS 452.

Item #2, reinforcement for all repairs greater than 10' in length, shown on Standard Drawing BP-2.5 is not required for this project.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2012 8:26:25 AM

Ref.9 Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement, MISC:11.5" Class MS refers to CMS Specification 452 which also applies to portions of CMS 451. Do to the scope of the project (Full Depth Pavement Repairs) CMS 451.12 will be impossible to achieve. ODOT needs to waive this requirement on this project. Please review and issue an addendum for this specification modification.

There will be no waiver of CMS 451.12. Please bid accordingly.