

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 060433

Sale Date - 10/18/2006

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

Can the existing plans be made available?

The plans are available at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Plans/060433/>

Question Submitted: 10/10/2006

Question Number: 2

Our question refers to the closure of SR-281 for the reconstruction of Bridge #DEF-281-0123 over the Maumee River. After reviewing scope of work, we feel the 75 day closure is not adequate to complete work. We believe a 90 day closure is required, thank you for reviewing.

We feel that the 75 day closure is adequate to perform the necessary work.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2006

Question Number: 3

Our question refers to the closure of Carpenter Rd. After reviewing the scope of work, we feel the 120 day closure is not adequate to complete work. We believe a 150 day closure is required, thank you for reviewing.

We feel that the 120 day closure is adequate to perform the necessary work.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2006

Question Number: 4

This contract includes the Fuel Price Adjustment proposal note #520. The method for bidding and calculating the fuel price adjustment contained in this proposal note must be revised. At the present, it reads, "The Contract Base Price (Cbp) will be the Monthly Base Price (Mbp) for the month the contract was bid." Because the monthly base price cannot be determined until after the bidding month has expired, the previous month base price must be used to bid and calculate this item. If this note is not revised for this bid, we would ask ODOT to specifically state the monthly base price that must be used to bid this project.

There is adequate information available on the Division of Construction Management, Office of Construction Administration website at: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/construction/OCA/default.htm> to determine a trend in Fuel Price Adjustment and estimate the Contract Base Price (Cbp) for the current month. The Fuel Price Adjustment (Fpa) provision is intended to minimize risk to the Contractor due to unanticipated dramatic fuel price fluctuations that may occur during the construction of ODOT projects. This provision is not designed to estimate actual quantities of fuel used in construction operations, but to provide a reasonable basis for calculating a fuel price adjustment based on average conditions.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2006

Question Number: 5

MSE Wall spec is normal but MSE not on plan sheet specify integral concrete panels with clear seal. CIP coping on panels is colored with stain which is field applied.

The liner spec is normal to produce an attractive structure but the integral concrete is not correct. Stain should be allowed to replace integral concrete color.

In my 23 years in MSE wall in Ohio have not seen this request to make structural panels architectural via integral panels. Architectural panels might cost \$45 / sq ft and the normal \$15.00 per sq ft.

In the event of the spec not being altered ADL will have to pass and not bid. Please rethink this as not something you can get just because you specify you want it.

The main problem beyond staggering first costs will be the arbitrary addition of a quality control program used by architects where samples delivered will be rejected as not meeting the one sample on job.

This massive rejection would stop the wall construction while waiting on new panels. This architectural spec interpretation will be applied as reasonable if that person does not realize that MSE panels are not architectural panels.

You have had only one bidder on MSE in OHIO for months. This situation won't help the situation. I tried to send this yesterday but I failed to send.

The plans can be built with the specs that we have incorporated and the Dist. does not wish to allow the use of epoxy sealers to replace the integral concrete. As for the architectural features of the walls this is what we wish to go with. There shall be no addendum needed the plans are biddable and buildable.

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: 10/13/2006

Question Number: 6

On plan sheet 35 there is a note for a Work Zone Impact Attenuator description however we haven't found a corresponding bid item. Please add a bid item if you intend to include the WZ Impact attenuator in the bid.

The Work Zone Impact Attenuator description is in the plans to inform the contractor as to what type we would require, as for payment it is included with the maintaining traffic, as per plan as stated on sheet 32. As the contractor may need to provide an attenuator for his MOT plans or he may not depending on how he prepares the MOT for the project and abides by the requirements of the standards and manuals. No addendum should be required.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2006

Question Number: 7

WHAT IS THE WALL THICKNESS ON THE 24 INCH AND 12 INCH CASING TO BE BORED AND JACKED?

Question Submitted: 10/2/2006

Question Number: 8

The plan for the 16'x 10' box culver on sheet 485/851 shows the existing channel outside of proposed box culvert centerline. The typical section for the LSM on sheet 486/851 shows the LSM pay quantity to slope up on a 1:1. In the area under pavement what type of material is required to fill the void outside of the LSM pay quantity to fill the original channel?

Item 203 Embankment is to be used to fill the void outside of the LSM pay quantity to fill the original channel. The material is accounted for in the embankment quantities.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2006

Question Number: 9

There is approx 700 cy of Rock Channel Protection, Type C with filter shown on sheet 640/851 for the slopes under the Garrett Creek Structures but no quantity has been carried to the general summary. Since this was missed there probably has been no quantity of channel excavation carried to the general summary either.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2006

Question Number: 10

on sheet 469/851 the plans call for the existing culvert to be 9'-1" x 14'-10" Conc. It is actually a multi-plate

Question Submitted: 10/3/2006

Question Number: 11

General Note on Page 29/851 for Item 603 - Conduit Bored or Jacked calls for .50 inch ungalvanized casing pipe. Is this casing pipe to act as the final storm structure or is the intent to have a larger casing pipe (24" - 30") to house a 15" conduit?

Question Submitted: 10/5/2006

Question Number: 12

Due to all of the restrictions and requirements associated with the construction of the embankment, roadway and safety items, MSE walls, and unique features of the bridge structure, the 120-day construction period for Carpenter Road would not be sufficient to complete the work. Can someone review and reconsider this restriction with the possibility of increasing this time?

We feel that the 120-day closure limitation is adequate time to complete all construction activities associated with the Carpenter Road structure including embankment construction, roadway items, MSE walls, etc. As stated on sheet 33 of 851, the additional time required for consolidation of the embankment is excluded from the 120 days

Question Submitted: 10/6/2006

Question Number: 13

The general notes discuss cutting the precast tops in an attempt to make the pipe fit into the # 4 catch basins. Has there been any consideration of how this is going to effect the top. Depending on the location and depth of cut it may effect the structural strength of the top. Also cutting into the top is going to jeopardize the epoxy coating on the rebar. One solution would be to downsize the pipe and add additional structures if necessary.

This was addressed in addendum #6. The note to cut the precast catch basins was removed.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006

Question Number: 14

1. Regarding the SS 1059 asphalt with the 3 year warranty, is the Superpave design required or can we assume that similar to the SS 880 asphalt, the Contractor may use any asphalt concrete mix design so long as the warranty requirements are met?

2. In the Defiance County Eastbound lanes, there are approximately 67 trench crossings of the mainline pavement. There is only one, 1.5" warranty surface course overlay being placed in this area. Can the PN 420 be waived in this eastbound Def Co area and if not can at least the locations of the trench crossings be exempted?

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: 10/9/2006

Question Number: 15

On reference items 197 , 200 ,201, 202 , 203, 205 , proposal says material to be a certain type (example type a)but plans sheets give you specific types of pipe. (example 707.01). Which is correct.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2006

Question Number: 16

1. Are all pavement restorations for pipe installations going to be paid for on this project?
2. What are the pavement restoration dimensions?
3. In the area of existing waterbound macadam, what pavement design is supposed to be used to replace the pavement for culverts and crossovers?
4. The plan indicates that the existing pavement has a variable depth of asphalt. What thickness limits does ODOT want the contractor to bid for pavement removal? (See sheet 11)
5. Sheet 67 indicates a correction on excavation and embankment quantities for pavement removals. How was the (-)70,578 cy. and 26,500 cy. determined?
6. What piece of equipment is available to perform the 5 ½' wide 16" deep lime stabilized subgrade treatment for the inside shoulders on the EBL of US24? We aren't aware of one. (See sheet 13)

Question Submitted: 9/14/2006

Question Number: 17

Due to the amount of subcontractors on this project and in particular the size of the Asphalt Paving subcontract, we would like to request a lowering of the 50% rule for the prime contractor to 40%

Question Submitted: 9/15/2006

Question Number: 18

Will the seeding and mulching quantity be broke out per seed mix requested?

Question Submitted: 9/15/2006

Question Number: 19

On sheet 582 under additional MSE wall information they talk about constructing the approach embankments. To what limits are the approach embankments to be constructed? On the previous contract we were instructed to place sheet piling along the face of the future MSE wall so that the embankments could be cosntructed up to the subgrade elevation for the consolidation period. After consolidation we removed the sheet piling and the embankment material so that the MSE wall and its granular embankment could be placed. Is this you intention? If it is there should be a cofferdam crib and sheeting item in the MOT for this item.

The limits of the select granular fill for the wall the limits are shown to the extent that we know them the wall manufacture will set final strap lengths which will dictate the limits even further and cofferdams, cribs and sheeting are provided in the structure quantities

Question Submitted: 9/19/2006

Question Number: 20

Ref. NO. 149: 1,062 Lf. Ground Mounted Support, W10 X 12, this quantity should be 978 Lf.. There is a math error on sub summary sheet 537. This will also effect the breakaway beam connection quantity, from 156 Ea. to 152 Ea..

Question Submitted: 9/22/2006

Question Number: 21

For the SR 281 bridge over the Maumee River, Sheet 33/39 gives a pour sequence showing the center section pouring first. It also states that the contractor has the option to use a different sequence subject to the approval of the Director. What are the parameters tha will be used to review the pour sequence?

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: 9/22/2006

Question Number: 22

1.) Question regarding the eastbound mainline area on the Henry County portion of the project.

On plan sheet #13, in the top typical section, on the eastbound side, the section shows the surface of the shoulder reconstruction matching the surface of the existing mainline pavement. Then on plan sheet #63, in the column for 442, 12.5mm Surface Course with 1059 Warranty, the line for USR 24 (EB), Sta 0+00 to 244+00 shows a quantity of 2,699.56 CY. It appears that this quantity is for paving the mainline in this area which is not shown in the typical section.

Which plan sheet is correct? If the section is to be paved, will it also be milled so that the elevations on the shoulder match?

2.) Regarding PN 420 - Surface Smoothness Requirements. Is this requirement intended to be applied to the mainline USR 24 pavements where the warranty pavements (880 & 1059) are utilized or is it also intended to apply to the cross roads, local roads and service roads?

3.) For the temporary crossovers, will the pavement for the temporary crossovers be paid for under Ref #185, Pavt for Maintaining Traffic or in any other ref#?

4.) Regarding the SS 880 asphalt with the 7-year warranty, on plan sheets 12 & 14, the legend item #1 lists a conventional equivalent utilizing SuperPave designs for the intermediate and surface courses. Are the SuperPave designs required or only shown for informational purposes? With the warranty can the contractor utilize the mixes he chooses to satisfy the warranty concerns?

5.) For the constructability of the project, portions of the new warranty pavement will need to be utilized for maintaining traffic before the surface course is installed. Does the warranty period in this area begin when the traffic is moved to this area?

Question Submitted: 9/22/2006

Question Number: 23

page 37 of the plans in the general notes
under 622-PORTABLE CONCRETE BARRIER

The notes specifically state that portable concrete barrier for this project shall use the JJ Hooks connections and that the pin and loop connection shall not be used.

Is this note correct, and if so what is the reasoning behind this?

Question Submitted: 9/22/2006

Question Number: 24

Upon receipt of Addendum 1, I have the following questions regarding the MSE walls.

1. Supplemental Spec 840 calls for pay items for the new quantities on the bridge general summary pages but no new bid items were added to the proposal.

2. Foundation Preparation. Under Basis of Payment, The Department will pay for all work described in 840.03G and 840.06D. Under 840.03G we are to furnish Filter Fabric and Crushed Stone. Under 840.06D we are to place the filter fabric and 12" of granular material type C. Since there is no undercut on the rear abutment at Carpenter Rd there should be no granular material type C for this abutment yet there has been 165 cy carried to the general summary for this work. We also feel that all of the Granular Material, Type C quantities are in error due to the one foot of material that is included in foundation preparation.

3. Under 840.06C Wall Excavation, we are to excavate to the limits shown on the plans. On the rear abutment for the Domersville structure there is 727 sy of foundation preparation. We agree with this quantity. However, the total cut for this structure is approx 8' which gives a wall excavation quantity of 1940 cy not the 800 shown on the general summary. On the forward abutment there is more area and a deeper cut but the excavation quantity is less. The excavation quantities for Carpenter rd seem to be correct.

Question Submitted: 9/22/2006

Question Number: 25

188 linear ft. of 14' x 9' conduit Type A 706.05
184 LINEAR FT. OF 16' X 8' CONDUIT TYPE A 706.05

The plans provide no areas of steal for either of these box culverts.

Question Submitted: 9/25/2006

Question Number: 26

Due to the changes in the MSE wall specification numerous quantities are in error. Some of these are as follows

On the Carpenter Road MSE wall quantities we feel the following are in error

| | Plan | E.S.W. |
|--------------------|------|--------|
| 1. Drainage pipe | 316 | 825 |
| 2. Granular Type C | 1055 | 650 |

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: 9/25/2006

Question Number: 27

MSE Wall Pay item question.

Will additional pay items be added to the MSE wall bid items as indicated in Supplemental Spec. 840 (840.09 Payment)

Question Submitted: 9/26/2006

Question Number: 28

Thank you for answering my question with addendum #2. But I still don't know of the 1,414,701 SY of seeding and mulching what seed mix we are to use? Please advise.

The contractor is to use a standard seed mix as set forth in CMS Item 659 "Seeding and Mulching".

Question Submitted: 9/26/2006

Question Number: 29

Ref. #339/Seeding and Mulching - Which seed mix will be used?

Use the standard seed mix as set forth in CMS Item 659 - Seeding and Mulching.

Question Submitted: 9/26/2006

Question Number: 30

What is the schedule for planting the Deciduous and Evergreen Trees?

According to CMS 661.06 "Dig and plant all plants after September 15 and before June 1. Plant replacement plants after September 15 and before June 1. Water according to Item 662."

Question Submitted: 9/28/2006

Question Number: 31

After receipt of addenda 5, we found the following MSE wall quantities errors

Ref no 411 and 422 the quantities were reversed. Ref 411 should be 4180 cy and 422 should be 1500 cy

Question Submitted: 9/30/2006

Question Number: 32

Neither Standard Drawing MT 95.70, nor the Location and Design Manual outline the design requirements for the lengths and tapers for entering and exiting pavement through the crossovers. Certainly, there must be some design criteria based upon traffic speed.

Since this plan has no MOT and since the bidder must perform this task, we need to have this information. Based upon crossovers on the adjacent project and comparing them with the existing 4-lane to 2-lane tapers at the ends of this project, there appears to be no consistency. There is a 35:1 taper for edgelines shown in the MT 95.70 drawing but that would produce a 2100' (35 X 60' of median) of entering or exiting pavement that can not be found on any project.

Even the plan specified first year minimum pavement construction for the WBL 750+00 stagger with the EBL 744+00 would allow only a 600' pavement through an entering or exiting pavement for the crossover. We have found numbers varying from 600' to 700' to 1300' to 2100'. The usual (speed) X (feet of lane shift) does not appear to apply. What do we use?

The contractor designed MOT requires the use of all appropriate manuals, the contractor should also be familiar with the OMUTCD (Ohio Manual of Uniform traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways), See Part 6 for guidance in designing the crossovers.

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.