

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 100056

Sale Date - 2/4/2010

Question Submitted: 1/18/2010

Question Number: 1

Can the plans for the existing structures be made available online?

The existing plans are on our ftp at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/CLI-68-20.28/Existing_Plans/

Question Submitted: 1/19/2010

Question Number: 2

On pages 25 and 26 of the drawings, there is a column with quantities from office calcs. Please posts these calculations, thank you.

Pavement Calc on ftp at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/CLI-68-20.28/PaveCalc/>

Question Submitted: 1/20/2010

Question Number: 3

The quantity for the square yard temporary pavement item includes 300 square yards of contingency as noted on plan sheet 8 of 65. There should be a separate bid item for this work for the following reasons: First, the excavation for this contingency work needs to be included in the lump sum bid item for temporary roads per the 615 spec item, not knowing if this work is going to be performed or not restricts bidders from including or not including the excavation and restoration in this item. Second, I would assume that the Engineer would leave this temporary pavement in place instead of removing it since the width of the outside shoulders is not changing, the non contingency temporary pavement needs to be removed, there is a mix of work here that is impossible to bid not knowing what is going to be performed. An easy solution would be to set up a separate bid item for this contingency work that would be an as per plan item that would include the excavation and leaving this pavement in place. Also, with the schedule being critical on this project, when will the Engineer determine if this work is required? This temporary pavement, though a small quantity, must be completed prior to going into phase 1 of the project.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/21/2010

Question Number: 4

Plan sheet 56 of 65 shows a cross section of the beam seat detailing the location of proposed dowel holes. Note 1 on this same sheet mentions to avoid hitting existing rebar while drilling these holes. With the backwall being left in place and end cross frames being left in place, this does not leave much room for movement to adjust where a hole can be drilled. A possible solution would be to completely remove the end cross frames and replace with new ones, a bid item would have to be added for this or a note added to include these additional cost as an incidental item for these dowel holes. Plan sheet 54 of 65 shows the limits of sealing on the existing columns and pier caps. Is it your intent to completely remove the existing sealer prior to applying the new sealer?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2010

Question Number: 5

There is a detail on sheet 9 showing connection of PCB wall to the bridge parapet using sections of guardrail, where is this cost to be included?

The connection mentioned between the PCB and the Bridge Parapet is to be paid for under the 622 Portable Concrete Barrier, 32" pay item as a connector per CMS 622.09.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2010

Question Number: 6

Please verify the qty. for Reference # 113 & 131 - Class QSC1 Substructure Concrete 21 cy. This qty. appears to be significantly overstated.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2010

Question Number: 7

Plan sheets 30, 31 and 32 show the shoulders on all four corners of the structure being replaced with full depth asphalt, as indicated by the cross hatched areas. However, the stations on the office calcs which were posted last week only show a portion of these shoulders being replaced. Are the office calcs incorrect or are the drawings incorrect?

The plans and office calcs were revised in October of 2009. The correct office calcs are on the ftp site at the same location as before. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/CLI-68-20.28/PaveCalc/REV_CLI68_PAVEMENT_COMPS.pdf

Question Submitted: 1/25/2010

Question Number: 8

The plans call for the removal of the existing abutment backwalls down to the approach slab seats and salvaging the existing rebar. Is it acceptable to sawcut this portion of the backwall off and dowel in replacement reinforcing steel?

The contractor is to bid as if the existing abutment backwall steel is to be salvaged. Alternative designs for this item of work would be considered at the Pre-con Meeting and would be at the Departments discretion.

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.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/26/2010

Question Number: 9

The MOT drawings for phases 1 and 2 show existing traffic signals being relocated. Where is this work paid?

Since this is not separately itemized, this should be paid for under the Lump Sum 614 Maintaining Traffic per 614.16.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2010

Question Number: 10

Page 7/65 of Plans state the permitted lane closures shall only be allowed during the times specified in the "District 8, permitted lane closure times" at the website http://plcm.dot.state.oh.us/plcm/plcm_web.jsp. When accessing this website, I am unable to determine what the permitted lane closures will be allowed or restricted. Please advise.

At the web site select Search PLC Times. Then select the year of 2009, the District of 8, the county of CLI, the Route of IR-71, the section of Warren County Line to Greene County Line and select GO. From the results you should be able to read the permitted lane closures.

Question Submitted: 1/27/2010

Question Number: 11

There is a high probability that the existing cross frames will interfere with the installation of a high percentage of the flange retrofits shown on plan sheet 59 of 65. Without knowing the exact number of cross frames that will have to be moved and reattached, can an item be set up for this work. Also, can the existing cross frames be reused? Will the Item 514 grinding fins and tears note on plan sheet 53 of 65 which includes touch up painting be used for these repair areas where the cross frames are removed?

Question Submitted: 1/28/2010

Question Number: 12

The existing drawings posted do not have these structures included. Are they available?

The drawings on the ftp site are correct. In the 1962 plans, the bridge was called CLI-1-0857 L&R. In the 1998 plans, the bridge was called CLI-71-0857. The ftp link is ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/CLI-68-20.28/Existing_Plans/

Question Submitted: 1/29/2010

Question Number: 13

Can you please clarify what costs are to be included in Line item 0093-Roads for maintaining traffic? There is also Line item 0094 - Pavment for maintaining traffic, Class A. Please clarify pay item 0093.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2010

Question Number: 14

Plan note on sheet 54/65 for item 607 special vpf removed and rebuilt, states that "new base plates, closure plates and anchoring hardware are required. We question the need for closure plates based on standard drawing VPF-1-90. "closure plates are not required on PS-4 posts or on new concrete parapets with horizontal rail elements." Please clarify.

The language in the note is written like a catch all for no matter what post or parapet it is placed on. Since the existing bridge does not have closure plates and the standard drawing does not call for closure plates for this type of installation, the closure plate reference in the note can be ignored.

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.