

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070027

Sale Date - 1/24/2007

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 1

The plan notes state that the contractor shall not sawcut the existing resteel in the removal of parts of the substructure units in Part 2. It has been common practice to allow the contractor to perform the sawcut removal in lieu of utilizing 35 lb jack hammers. The resulting replacement resteel, drilling and grouting has been at the contractor's expense. Due to the short term closure for this replacement(60 days), we are requesting the department consider allowing the sawcutting option. It is much more efficient and economical and not detrimental to the quality of the project.

The District has considered your request and respectfully declines to change the requirements. The District is aware of this practice and it has become way to common. The District is cracking down on this and some other practices that are knowingly convenient but not the best practice for a long life of the structure. The District wants to make it clear in the contract documents that this method of removal is not allowed up front and that the bid should not be based on the sawcut removal of the concrete.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 2

The plan notes state that the contractor shall not sawcut the existing resteel in the removal of parts of the substructure units in Part 2. It has been common practice to allow the contractor to perform the sawcut removal in lieu of utilizing 35 lb jack hammers. The resulting replacement resteel, drilling and grouting has been at the contractor's expense. Due to the short term closure for this replacement(60 days), we are requesting the department consider allowing the sawcutting option. It is much more efficient and economical and not detrimental to the quality of the project.

The District has considered your request and respectfully declines to change the requirements. The District is aware of this practice and it has become way to common. The District is cracking down on this and some other practices that are knowingly convenient but not the best practice for a long life of the structure. The District wants to make it clear in the contract documents that this method of removal is not allowed up front and that the bid should not be based on the sawcut removal of the concrete.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2007

Question Number: 3

Does this project fall under the old 898 supplemental spec where bonuses will be paid for the superstructure concrete or the revised 898 supplemental spec.

The plans were developed under SS898 dated 07/16/04. Therefore SS898 dated 07/21/06 would not apply.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2007

Question Number: 4

Does this project fall under the old 898 supplemental spec where bonuses will be paid for the superstructure concrete or the revised 898 supplemental spec.

The plans were developed under SS898 dated 07/16/04. Therefore SS898 dated 07/21/06 would not apply.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.