

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 080436

Sale Date - 7/16/2008

Question Submitted: 5/30/2008

Question Number: 1

Can the existing plans for bridge 670-0904B Ramp E1 & H1 over Johnstown Road be put on an ftp site?

<http://www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/Attach/FRA-75293/>

Question Submitted: 6/12/2008

Question Number: 2

1. 1. The notes under "Overnight Detours for Setting Steel over Ramps and Roads" on plan sheet 30/700 stating that Ramp G1 & Ramp D1 will be closed and detoured are in conflict with the plan note on plan sheet 37/700 that states that 15 minute closures will be allowed for setting beams. Please revise the note on plan sheet 37/700 to be consistent with the plan notes on sheet 30/700.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2008

Question Number: 3

Will stay-in-place forms be allowed on this project?

No

Question Submitted: 6/16/2008

Question Number: 4

Are SIP forms allowed on this project?

Question Submitted: 6/23/2008

Question Number: 5

Ref 100 - Special - trench drain Where can you find the requirements for this "Special" bid item?

Question Submitted: 6/24/2008

Question Number: 6

When will the prebid meeting transcript be available?

Question Submitted: 6/24/2008

Question Number: 7

Would the department consider changing the type "A" barrier wall to a type "B" barrier wall.

Question Submitted: 6/24/2008

Question Number: 8

This question is regarding the MSE walls E and D shown on Sheets 610 through 627. As per sheet 610 (second column, third paragraph), provide soil reinforcement with a minimum length of 28-ft to ensure external stability. Sheets 620 and 625 provide the limits of excavation and pay limits of proprietary wall embankment. The pay limits provided on sheets 620 and 625 do not reflect the requirement that the minimum reinforcement length along the entire length of wall is 28-ft. So please confirm that the intent of the design is to provide a minimum strip length of 28-ft. along the entire length of Wall E and D to ensure external stability.

Question Submitted: 6/25/2008

Question Number: 9

Will rebar be required in the Concrete Barrier Type D APP A

Question Submitted: 6/25/2008

Question Number: 10

Should Reference # 39 and #43 be Single Slope type B, as there is no type A shown in standard Sheets RM4.3 & RM 4.4? Reference #41 Single Slope Type D, APP-A shows rebar in the ramp D Barriers Only. This detail appears to be from the end anchor detail on standard drawing RM4.5 2/2. Is this the intent? Reference #40; Should there be a bid item for Single Slope Type D anchors? Reference #94 has standard Single Slope Type D inlets constructed with the Type D Single Slope APP-B showing 20 feet deductions for each inlet. How will the sleeper slab be paid for in the deduct areas?

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: 6/25/2008

Question Number: 11

1. The earthwork subsummary sheet 62 makes a deduction for structural fill. The quantity of the deduction is roughly equivalent to the totals of the select granular backfill and natural soil items in the MSE walls. Is this what the deduction is for? If so, why does the deduction not include the embankment, aggregate base, and granular material items for the MSE walls? 2. Will the Department require pile sleeves in the MSE select granular backfill on this project? Some recent projects have eliminated them during construction. 3. If used, will the Department allow the MSE pile sleeves to be backfilled with sand rather than bentonite slurry? 4. Per SS840, the Natural Soil, Wall Excavation, and Select Granular Backfill items will be paid based on actual field calculations. Will the Embankment APP, Granular Material Type B, Aggregate Base, and Foundation Preparation items also be adjusted based on actual field measurements? Additionally, the roadway quantities behind the MSE wall will need to be adjusted to account for MSE reinforcement length changes in conjunction with the items mentioned above. 5. Is the Aggregate Base bid item in the MSE walls intended to pay for the bottom 3' of the Select Granular Zone? If so, does this material need to meet the requirements of SS840 or the 304 specification? 6. Sheet 508 calls out Item 203, Granular Material, Type C under the Select Granular Backfill. No such item exists; shouldn't this material be included in the Foundation Preparation bid item per SS840?

Question Submitted: 6/26/2008

Question Number: 12

Have the cross section end area quantities been corrected for pavement removal?

Question Submitted: 6/27/2008

Question Number: 13

This job has a total of 2260 ea Workzone RPMs, As Per Plan which is enough to place WZRPMs, APP on all edge lines and channelizing lines at 20 ft spacings throughout the entire job. Is this ODOT's intent? Could ODOT please provide a sub-summary for the work zone raised pavement markers, APP? We will need to know the location of all of the WZRPMs, APP ODOT plans to install on the job in order to determine if they will be 614 or 621 RPMs.

Question Submitted: 6/27/2008

Question Number: 14

Please verify that the MSE wall lengths shown on developed elevation on sheets 670 and 671 are correct. Using station and offset differences provided on the same sheets, the wall is longer than what is shown.

Question Submitted: 6/27/2008

Question Number: 15

The MSE wall limits show excavation on 1:1 slopes. If this is not attainable due to the existing soil conditions and safe practices, will the contractor be paid for the actual excavation and backfill performed?

Question Submitted: 6/30/2008

Question Number: 16

Is there a designated field office site for this job? Will we be permitted to use existing airport property for the site?

Question Submitted: 6/6/2008

Question Number: 17

1. The bid quantity for Bid Item 331 appears to be low. The splice weights may have been left off the total. Please revise in an addendum.

"The weights of the steel in the splices were intentionally left out of the structural steel quantity as the splices are considered "optional". However, since some fabrication shops may have a problem transporting the 150-foot long girders to the site the optional splice locations with accompanying details were provided in the plans. If the optional splices are required the additional weight is to be considered incidental to the current quantity of steel. For information purposes the calculated weight of one line of splices (one splice @ 5 girders) is 7768 lbs."

Question Submitted: 6/9/2008

Question Number: 18

1. The quantity for bid item 452 appears to be substantially overstated. Please check and revise in an addendum.

"The pay item quantity of 1,621 CU YD in question includes 374 CU YD for the rear abutment (a stub type abutment on MSE wall) and 1,247 CU YD for the forward abutment (a full-height type abutment that includes a cast-in-place retaining wall and a 4-foot thick footing mat connecting the two). The quantity may appear to be overstated due to the extraordinary size of the forward abutment."

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: 6/9/2008

Question Number: 19

As per Sheet 533 (or 3 of 33), the existing structure plans for Bridge FRA-670-0904B (Ramps E1 and H1) are available at District 6 office. Are the drawings for the existing MSE walls available? Is it possible to provide these plans for through the Ohio DOT FTP site. Also include the drawings for the existing MSE walls as well in the FTP site.

<http://www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/Attach/FRA-75293/>

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 20

Ref 446, Unclassified Excavation for Bridge 0522-B: This item is for the excavation & backfill of the forward abutment footing slab. By CMS 503.09.B the limits of responsibility for this pay item is to the top of the existing ground. That leaves the volume between the existing ground and the approach slab subgrade unaccounted for. This is a VERY LARGE volume (>2000cy) that I do not believe is covered in any pay item. Since the entire area is under a large oddly-shaped approach slab, is directly adjacent to 2 MSE wall sections, I would assume that it will be granular. Please advise...

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 21

Ref 446, Unclassified Excavation for Bridge 0522-B: This item is for the excavation & backfill of the forward abutment footing slab. By CMS 503.09.B the limits of responsibility for this pay item is to the top of the existing ground. That leaves the volume between the existing ground and the approach slab subgrade unaccounted for. This is a VERY LARGE volume (>2000cy) that I do not believe is covered in any pay item. Since the entire area is under a large approach slab, and is directly adjacent to 2 MSE wall sections, I would assume that it will be granular. Please advise...

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 22

The question is regarding the aesthetic treatment for MSE walls. The aesthetic treatment details shown on sheets such as 549 and 587 suggest the visual appearance of a nominal square panel. However, the supplemental provisions as well as the plan notes allow the use of rectangular panels. Please confirm that rectangular panels are acceptable for this project.

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 23

Please clarify the use of items in the bridges for Embankment and Embankment APP. The section for Wall K on sheet 486 only calls out the backfill in front of the wall as Item 203 Embankment for the bridge item (the area behind/under the select granular is listed as "Roadway Quantity") therefore item 213 appears to be dramatically overstated. The quantity and section for Wall L appear to correspond. Walls J,H,G,F show the area behind/under the select granular paid with the bridge item, but no backfill in front of the wall. The walls on Bridge 0904B include area both behind and in front of the wall. Sheet 626 for Walls D & E again pays for the backfill in front of the wall but nothing behind it so the quantities are greatly overstated. There is no consistency throughout the project. Please clarify what is paid in each item and correct quantities as needed.

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 24

SS840 dated 01-19-07 is specified in the plans. Should this be updated to the most current version of SS840 dated 04-18-08? This will allow the use of larger panels which will decrease the overall cost of this project. Additionally, the aesthetic pattern will need to be modified by the supplier slightly in order to accommodate 5x10 panels.

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 25

Should Reference #39 and #43 be Single Slope Type B, as there is no type A Shown in Standards sheet RM4.3 & 4.4? Reference #41 Single Slope Type D, APP-A shows rebar in the ramp D Barriers only. This detail appears to be from the end anchor detail on standard drawing RM4.5 2/2. Is this the intent? Reference #40 should there be a bid item for Single Slope Type D Anchors? Reference #94 Has standard Single Slope Type D Inlets constructed with the Type D Single Slope APP-B showing 20' deductions for each inlet. How will the sleeper slab be paid for in the deduct areas?

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 26

On sheets 78 and 79, it says 670 Ditch Protection, but it does not specify which one. Which type of 670 Ditch Protection is required for this job?

Question Submitted: 7/10/2008

Question Number: 27

This question is in regards to the answer given to Question #11 on Addendum #2. The only standards for reinforcing Type D barrier is RM 4.5 pg 2of2 (for 15' end anchorages) and RM 4.6 pg 3of3 (for 14' end sections), the answer in addendum 2 says reinforce all type D barrier per standard drawings (we assume this means Ref # 40,41,and42). Where do we find the reinforcing standard for a Type D barrier with an 8.5" top (see plan page 17)? Also, were do we find the standard for reinforcing a regular Type D barrier (not including the end anchorages and end sections).

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: 7/2/2008

Question Number: 28

There is a note on plan page 51/700 stating work zone pavement removal from the First Project is to be removed by the Second Project. Please specify the bid item to include the cost of this removal.

Since there is no specific item set up for this removal, it should be included in the Lump Sum bid for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 7/2/2008

Question Number: 29

1) Maintenance of Traffic General Notes on page 30 of the plans has a specific heading "Overnight Detours for Setting Steel over Ramps and Roads". The note allows for ramps G-1, D-1 and EB ramp of Int'l Gateway to be closed and detoured between 10:00 PM and 4:00 AM on two, two and three consecutive nights, respectively. Pages 37, 38 and 39 have conflicting notes allowing for a 15 minute temporary closure to set beams between 12:00 AM and 5:00 AM. Please confirm that the page 30 note governs. 2) All three girder bridges have a general note titled "Structural Steel Members, Level 4, As Per Plan". The note indicates that each of the three girder bridges require temporary bracing and a stainless steel drip strip at the end cross frames. Is the weight of the temporary bracing and drip strip measured for pavement of steel or is it incidental (not included for payment)? 3) Bridge 0904B (page 554) shows the HP 10 x 42 temporary support having a shop or field weld to both the bottom load plate and the top connection plate. The HP support is included with the bearing for payment and the assembly is shop galvanized. Please indicate the HP support welds as "shop" to be consistent with bridge 0928B L&R (page 631). 4) Bridge 0924B – Structural Steel Splice Note 5 on page 592 indicates splice material "shall be included with structural steel quantity for payment." The plan quantity does not appear to include this weight. This discrepancy has not been addressed in an addendum. 5) The same discrepancy in steel plan quantity for splices indicated in the question above also applies to bridge 0522B note 5 on page 684. Please reply. 6) All three girder bridges have a framing plan that appears to show intermediate (cross frame) stiffeners on the "outside" of the fascia girder webs. Please verify that you want stiffeners at these locations. 7) Bridge 0522B, plan sheet 651 show pile "order" lengths at 75 LF/EA for the rear abutment and 70 LF/EA for the forward abutment. The estimated "drive" lengths on page 649 are 75 LF/EA for the rear abutment and 75 LF for the forward abutment. Please confirm if the estimated lengths on page 649 should be 70 LF at the rear abutment and 65 LF at the forward abutment. 8) Bridge 0904B page 548 (MSE Wall Details). Please confirm that the "bottom" of the leveling pad (not the top) is flush with the top of the foundation preparation elevation. Does this shorten the MSE wall height by 6"? (S.F.?) 9) On Bridge 0522B an aesthetic surface treatment is called for on the abutment wall and retaining wall at the forward abutment. Where is this item to be paid? 10) Also on Bridge 0522B at the forward abutment, what type of backfill material is required from the porous backfill to the SGB at MSE walls A and B? This would specifically be the area above the footing.

Question Submitted: 7/2/2008

Question Number: 30

The MSE wall suppliers intend to utilize 5'x10' panels. will this be approved by ODOT?

Question Submitted: 7/2/2008

Question Number: 31

The embankment material behind the abutments and above the Select Granular Backfill of Bridge 670-0904B is 203 Embankment As Per Plan. The embankment material for all the rest of the bridges on this project in the same location is Item 203 granular Material Type B. Should the material for bridge 670-0904B be 203 Granular Material Type B also?

Question Submitted: 7/3/2008

Question Number: 32

1) Bridge 0928 shows and details the need for the shoring at the forward abutment to install the MSE walls next to Stelzer Road. There appears to be an identical need at the rear abutment, yet none is shown. There is also no shoring detailed in the middle of Stelzer for the construction of the piers. Coordinating this work with the MOT details, there is barrier set up to protect the forward excavation but not the rear MSE wall or the piers. There will be similar excavation depths at all locations with similar proximity to the traffic. Please clarify ODOT's expectations. 2) For bridge 0898, the shoulders and barriers are against the wall. There is no cofferdam item set up to pay for the shoring that is likely necessary. Please clarify ODOT's intent. 3) Bridges 0924 & 0522 have cofferdam items setup that will cover the shoring that is likely needed. 4) For all of the locations discussed above, no shoulder/pavement replacement/repair is detailed, and there are no items set up to compensate us for the work. Where are these costs to be paid?

Question Submitted: 7/3/2008

Question Number: 33

On this project the Select Granular embankment limits are shown sloping on a 1:1 requiring a substantial amount of premium material to be purchased for the project. Recent projects have been designed using a vertical limit. Can this project be changed to use a vertical limit instead of a 1:1 slope limit?

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: 7/7/2008

Question Number: 34

This series of questions was asked on 7/3 but has not appeared on the website. I am re-sending in the event you did not get them. If you did, please disregard.1)Bridge 0928 shows and details the need for the shoring at the forward abutment to install the MSE walls next to Stelzer Road. There appears to be an identical need at the rear abutment, yet none is shown. There is also no shoring detailed in the middle of Stelzer for the construction of the piers. Coordinating this work with the MOT details, there is barrier set up to protect the forward excavation but not the rear MSE wall or the piers. There will be similar excavation depths at all locations with similar proximity to the traffic. Please clarify ODOT's expectations.2)For bridge 0898, the shoulders and barriers are against the wall. There is no cofferdam item set up to pay for the shoring that is likely necessary. Please clarify ODOT's intent.3)Bridges 0924 & 0522 have cofferdam items setup that will cover the shoring that is likely needed.4)For all of the locations discussed above, no shoulder/pavement replacement/repair is detailed, and there are no items set up to compensate us for the work. Where are these costs to be paid?

Question Submitted: 7/9/2008

Question Number: 35

Regarding the new MSE wall specification: If the envelope for the SGB differs from the plan due to differences in the final designs (ie. differing designs for differing MSE wall suppliers), will the corresponding pay quantities be adjusted, or will the original plan's calculated envelope be the basis for the final pay quantities?

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.