

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 060264

Sale Date - 6/28/2006

Question Submitted: 5/10/2006

Question Number: 1

Where can we get a set of prints of the existing bridge? Or will the plan sheets be posted online?

**The existing plans have been located for Project 060264. Download them from this site:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Plans/060264/>**

Question Submitted: 5/11/2006

Question Number: 2

Just wanted to make sure that I understand this right, does the five year warranty apply for this project? I was under the understanding that this was tried once before and didn't work out so was removed.

Thanks
Luke

Question Submitted: 5/23/2006

Question Number: 3

In the prebid meeting it was said that no blasting will be allowed on the project. With technology today blasting can be performed under very controlled conditions. There are expert blasting subcontractors that have been used in Ohio on various projects and this one is not much different. There are always buildings, bridges dams etc near the blasting operation. If blasting of the bridge is not allowed the contractors bids may be increased by up to \$450,000 to allow for conventional removal of the existing piers. Please reconsider to allow blasting on this project.

Question Submitted: 5/23/2006

Question Number: 4

3-7/8" Strand Assemblies - Sheets 120 & 121 / 156

There are no provisions given for tensioning the 3-7/8" strand assemblies such as shim plates or adjustable rods. Based upon this , the assemblies cannot be installed and tensioned as needed.

The open socket to open socket arrangement cannot be tensioned as shown.

CBSI can provide suggested shimming sketches and / or actual socket termination type change if requested .

www.cbsiusa.com

Please advise!

Thank you

Jerry V Clodfelter

Question Submitted: 5/24/2006

Question Number: 5

The notes on Plan sheet 134A of 299 state that the precast sidewalk & the closure pours will be colored concrete. Substantial costs will be added to the project by coloring the concrete. Also, the sidewalk is being overlayed with MSC concrete that is not colored. Is the intent to see the colored concrete from under the bridge in the river and on the bikepath?

Question Submitted: 5/24/2006

Question Number: 6

Can the piers be built with horizontal construction joints instead of full height 1 pour?

Question Submitted: 5/25/2006

Question Number: 7

Page 54B of 299 denotes the Duct Bank installation. Under the "Legend Heading", reference is made to pavement replacement with the detail for this work shown to be on Page 291 & 292. The index on Page 1 of 299 show these pages not used. Could you please clarify or provide the detail by addendum.

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: 5/30/2006

Question Number: 8

Line 14, Bid Item 203E98600 Removable Bollards

Discussions with the supplier raised the following questions;

1. Bollards and Lockable Receiver are the same O.D. In order to insert the bollard into the receiver, the bottom 22" would have to be ground.
2. Bollards will weigh approximately 170 Lbs. These will have to be lifted 22" straight up for removal which can be very difficult. Does this meet your intent?

Line 60 & 61, Bid Items 638E10600 & 638E10800

I am unable to locate any information within the plans and specs on how this work is to be performed. Some of the questions are;

1. Is the hydrant and valve to be relocated laterally?
2. How are they connected to the existing main?
3. How much time is allotted for this work and what time will the main be shut off to allow for the work.
4. What Division of Water specs apply to these items and will they be made available by ODOT?

Question Submitted: 5/31/2006

Question Number: 9

Line 0048, Bid Item 305E12000, 8" Concrete Base

The Bid Item Quantity as stated in the general summary is 641 SY. However, on Page 20 of 299, Pavement Summary, the stationing totals 576 SY. Could you please verify.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2006

Question Number: 10

I am working on bidding engineering for the construction of the Main Street Bridge project ODOT project FRA 62-14.11 PID 77 467. In the drawing package on sheet 131 of 299 there is a note that states that the wind tunnel test results for this project are available from the city upon request. I would appreciate any help in locating this report. I would like to review it prior to finalizing our proposal for construction engineering to contractors bidding this project.

Please give me a call if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Brian Volpe, P.E., S.E.
ruby + associates
Phone: (248) 865-8855
Fax: (248) 865-9449
Mobile: (248) 514-4486
www.rubyusa.com

Question Submitted: 6/12/2006

Question Number: 11

Can the designer provide a stress sheet with the desired dead load stresses in the bridge? Ideally this would include stresses in the top and bottom of the edge girders and concrete deck at various points in the structure, and moments and axial loads in the arch.

How much deviation from the desired stresses is acceptable for locked-in erection stresses?

Question Submitted: 6/13/2006

Question Number: 12

Sheet 94 shows a hatched area for excavation at the Rich Street Abutment with a note to see sheet 121B for cut and fill quantities. Sheet 121B has no quantities for cut and fill and there is no biditem for unclassified excavation for this portion of the work. Please add a biditem or revise the landscaping excavation quantity to reflect this additional amount.

What we have on the plans is actually correct. Sheet 94 refers to sheet 121B for the quantities. Sheet 121B has all the quantities except for the MSE wall (Item "Special"). On sheet 121B, the MSE wall line items reference sheets 121I -121K. Shown on sheet 121J are the MSE wall quantities including the cut and fill quantities. Please notice the reference on sheet 121B, indicating to look at sheets 121I through 121K.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2006

Question Number: 13

I see that the completion date for this project is June 30, 2009. Do you have some idea to when the plant material will be installed?

Clarification is also needed on the Crataegus Phaenopyrum "Presidential" - this tree normally comes in caliper size? But it looks like they are also available in multi-stem. Which are you wanting used on this project?

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: 6/14/2006

Question Number: 14

We have developed a number of questions on specific reference numbers as follows:

Ref 210 Granular Embankment - our takeoff quantity is 744 cyd. It appears the proposal quantity has been doubled.

Ref 258 Abutment concrete - our takeoff quantity is approximately 1200 cyds. The proposal quantity is 2316 cyds or almost double.

Ref 268 Pavement Removed - We are having difficulty identifying where this quantity is coming from & what type of material is to be removed. Please clarify.

Ref 269 Walk removed - Does this item overlap with ref #3 or is this the hatched walk areas on the existing overlook shown on demolition plan sheet 88?

Ref 275 4" Concrete walk, APP - Please define the limits of this work. Is this the same work paid for under ref #20?

Ref 291 Asphalt Unit Pavers - How does the bituminous setting bed get paid? There is a pay item for this in the roadway items - Ref #59.

Ref 292 12" Colored Concrete Band - Please define the pay limits. Sheet 92 depicts this colored concrete band extending through the steps and walks and wall A. Is the color band incidental to the items it crosses?

Ref 341 Portions of Structures Removed - Please define the pay unit and how it relates to the structure to be removed.

Ref 367 Washed Gravel Under Tree Grates - Please check the pay quantity. It appears the quantity for ref #266 was inserted here.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2006

Question Number: 15

1. The existing structure data given on plan sheet 130 of 299 describes the existing structure as "earth filled". The existing plans issued by ODOT and during a site visit, the structure does not appear to be earth filled. Can ODOT confirm whether the structure is earth filled?

2. Special provision 10 Post-Tensioning has a requirement for two pressure tests for the ducts. The initial test is described on page 17 and includes pressurization to 5 psi for 5 minutes with a maximum 2 psi loss. The final test described on page 22 requires pressurization to 100 psi for 5 minutes with a maximum 10 psi loss. This specification has been changed on a previous project after constructability issues were raised on two current projects. We believe that this requirements should be changed to an initial test of 1.5 psi for 1 minute with a maximum pressure loss of 0.15 psi and a final test of 50 psi for 1 minute with an allowable pressure loss of 25 psi. Please confirm.

3. The general note on plan sheet 132 of 299 for Item 503 Unclassified Excavation, As Per Plan requires the backfill behind the abutments to be CMS 304 Aggregate Base or 703.11 structural backfill type 2. Item 203 Granular Embankment has pay limits as shown on Sheet 147 of 299 that do not go the full depth of the abutment. What are the limits of the CMS 304 Aggregate Base or 703.11 structural backfill type 2? Also, is the Granular Embankment pay item for the "select" granular embankment shown on plan sheet 147?

4. Where do the expansion joints between floor beams 10-11 and 23-24 shown on Sheet 231 of 299 get paid?

5. In addendum #4, ODOT removed the maximum 50 degree placement temperature. Under .03 Procedures of the revised Mass Concrete special provision, paragraph A. Mix design item 8, the requirement for the "injection of liquid nitrogen into batch water" is still included. Should this also be removed?

Question Submitted: 6/14/2006

Question Number: 16

Will the Buy American Act be applied to this project (#060264)? Please confirm.

Yes. Per CMS 106.09. The waiver process is in 106.09(D),

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: 6/15/2006

Question Number: 17

According to the Bridge Erection sequence the contractors have to temporarily support Arch segments 1 & 5 until arch segments 2 & 4 are erected. Once segments 2 & 4 are erected the temporary supports for segments 1 & 5 can be removed. This assumes that Arch sections 1-2 & 4-5 are stable if supported at or near the splice between segments 2-3 and 3-4. Are the segments 1-2 & 4-5 stable?

Question Submitted: 6/15/2006

Question Number: 18

RE: PN 520 – Fuel Price Adjustment

It is our understanding that ODOT's intent is to include Proposal Note 520 – Fuel Price Adjustment on all jobs that contain any category of work listed in the Table A-1 of PN 520 (see page 4 of PN 520). Since this project includes items of work that exceed the threshold quantities, should the Fuel Price Adjustment note be added to this project?

If not, will a Fuel Price Adjustment be added by change order to the successful bidder's contract?

Question Submitted: 6/15/2006

Question Number: 19

Re: Ref No. 11 Roadway, Misc.: Grass Driveway

What work is to be included with this item? The plan note on p.41 specifies a material to be used, however no other description can be found as to what is to be included in this item.

Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2006

Question Number: 20

According to the Bridge Erection sequence the contractors have to temporarily support Arch segments 1 & 5 until arch segments 2 & 4 are erected. Once segments 2 & 4 are erected the temporary supports for segments 1 & 5 can be removed. This assumes that Arch sections 1-2 & 4-5 are stable if supported at or near the splice between segments 2-3 and 3-4. Are the segments 1-2 & 4-5 stable?

Question Submitted: 6/15/2006

Question Number: 21

Due to the complexity of this project the Erection Engineering consultants and the Material suppliers have requested additional time to analyze their respective parts of the project so the best and most economical solutions can be formulated. It is in the best interest of the state and the city to delay this bid at least 1 week.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2006

Question Number: 22

Sheet 197 of 299: Structural Steel Notes, The specified 1" diameter, tension control bolts (ASTM 1852) are not available with the Type 3 material designation. Please clarify tension control bolt specification.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2006

Question Number: 23

The Excavation for the proposed 24" drainage conduit located on the South side of the Forward abutment of the bridge on plan sheet 27/299 is approximately 20-25 ft deep. The construction limits are only 4 ft from the centerline of of this pipe which is not enough room. The construction limits should be adjusted to allow for the deep excavations for the pipe and manholes. There is also not enough qty for the removal and replacement of the sidewalks, Bike Path, Concrete Slope Protection, and the Concrete Wall with Iron Railing. Please include these adjustments on the next addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2006

Question Number: 24

Please disregard previous question regarding existing timber piling removal, it appears that the structure removal biditem is actually set up for this purpose.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2006

Question Number: 25

1. Is it ODOT's intent to use the PCB already on the west side of the bridge for this project? Also, please add a bid item for the PCB shown on 17A.
2. There are no bid items set up for the construction fence and gates shown on sheet 12. Please add bid items for this work.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2006

Question Number: 26

Note #4 on sheet 121G appears to require a 7' embedment of new reinforcing steel into existing concrete for the #10 rebar dowels. This seems impractical given that typical doweling is 18-24". Please review this requirement and advise. Also, there is no biditem for dowel holes set up, unless one is added we will assume that they will be paid for by change order.

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: 6/19/2006

Question Number: 27

The special provisions for MSE walls state that the select granular material have a friction angle of 34°, a unit weight of 120 lbs/ft3 and have less than 7% P200 material. Our experience on previous projects shows that exactly meeting all three of these conditions is impossible. Other projects have allowed up to 15% P200 and also have changed the 34° friction angle and 120 lbs/ft3 to minimum requirements. Please make the same changes to this bid to allow for a constructable project.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2006

Question Number: 28

Note 4 on Sheet 122 states that removal of existing timber piling shall be paid for with the Lump Sum structure removal. This is unfair to the contractor since ODOT does not even know what the existing pile layout is - reference Note 2 on same page. ODOT should consider making any existing piling removal an extra to be paid by change order or add a bid item to remove piling by 'each'.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2006

Question Number: 29

Are the rock cores available for review and inspection by the drilled shaft contractor? If so, where and when can they be viewed?

Question Submitted: 6/21/2006

Question Number: 30

Plan sheet 134/299 shows a "Special - Epoxy Waterproofing overlay" on the Edge Beam Sidewalk. Is this actually bid item 215 Sealing Concrete Surfaces (Non-Epoxy)?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2006

Question Number: 31

Design sht 62 & 62A of 156 (North Floor Beams)

The stiffener bars on the North Floor Beam located at the hanger struts and the cable hangers (design sht 62) have not been detailed as to what type of weld is needed. Stiffener to Floor Beam Web and Stiffener to Floor Beam top and bottom flanges. ??? fillets or CJP welds

Design Sht 62A of 156 section ZZ. Are the stiffeners to the top flange fillet welds or CJP welds.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2006

Question Number: 32

The added reference no. 502 is for removing the existing bridge with explosives. In addendum no. 3 the item number is listed as 202E98000 but the ebs files and other places in the addendum call out item number 202E11003. This is the same item number as the original removal.

Also, do we have to bid each alternate removal item?

For Ref #502, the correct Item No. is 202E11003 as stated in the Added Bid Items table in addendum #3. The ebs file is correct. Each alternate must be bid.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2006

Question Number: 33

The piers appear to be floating on top of the drilled shafts. The bottom of the piers do not go to the stream bed. I see no provisions to place embankment under the piers. Is this what you really want? It seems you would want the piers to extend down to the stream bed in case the river elevation dropped in the future.

The pier design is based on economics. There is some provision for lowering the river a foot or so since the bottom of the pier is below the normal water level.. If the river is ever lowered more than that, it will be the responsibility of the agency lowering the dam to provide acceptable options for concealing the drilled shafts.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2006

Question Number: 34

Arch-strut detail, sheet 245 of 299. The 5 1/2" diameter portion of the pin will not allow the installation (thru a 5" diameter hole in strut connection) of this pin in the field during erection of the arch strut. What is the intended sequence of installing the pins w.r.t. the arch strut and floor beams?

Question Submitted: 6/5/2006

Question Number: 35

The special provision "Modular Expansion Joints" calls for a metalized coating system. Typically, hot dip galvanizing is used as a coating system for this product. Please confirm if this will be an acceptable substitution. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2006

Question Number: 36

Will powder coating over prepared hot dip galvanizing surface be allowed in lieu of item 514 hand painting for reference no. 230-233 bridge railing?

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: 6/5/2006

Question Number: 37

Arch-strut detail 3, sheet 246 of 299. The design of the strut calls for 5/16" fillet welds on all four of the interior and exterior corners of the web plate. Only 2 of the 4 interior fillet welds can be made prior to the assembling of both webs and both flanges into a box shape. Once the member is in a box shape, no welding can be done "inside". Will an alternate welding detail/design be provided?

Question Submitted: 6/6/2006

Question Number: 38

Arch Rib - Would additional Field Splice locations be permissible for the arch member? If so, could designs and details be provided prior to sale/bid date?

Question Submitted: 6/7/2006

Question Number: 39

There are two existing plaques that are to be restored to their original condition as indicated on plan sheet 106/299. What is their current condition?

Question Submitted: 6/8/2006

Question Number: 40

What material are the 12 embeded conduits under the south side sidewalk made out of? Existing plans say fiber. Unless directed otherwise we are going to assume that the material is not Asbestos or another hazardous substance.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2006

Question Number: 41

During discussions with the concrete suppliers on this project we noticed that GGBF Slag is specifically not allowed in the QSC1 or QSC3 mixes. What is the reasoning for this? With the lower maximum heat of hydration, and additional strength gained through the use of GGBF Slag its use would be beneficial. In regards to the permeability requirements for the two QSC3 mixes, GGBF Slag would allow for the 1500 coulomb requirement to be met. Portland cement by itself will probably not provide the lower permeability required. The use of GGBF Slag is the best solution to provide the performance required in these mixes.

The Class S modified mix for the drilled shafts presently requires the use of a #78 size coarse aggregate. The major aggregate suppliers in this area do not currently make this particular size. A #57 size aggregate would be preferable, but if a smaller coarse aggregate is required allow the use of a #8 size aggregate. I assume that GGBF Slag can be used in this mix.

In regard to the colored concrete that requires the use of White Portland cement and white sand, What is considered to be white sand?

Can an approved list of sand be supplied before the project is bid?

Can a GGBF Slag replacement in the concrete, which contains White cement, be used? This would be similar to Class C option 3, GGBF Slag is white in color and it has been used along with White Cement to produce white concrete. This would lower the cost of this concrete, as White Cement is very expensive.

The placement temperature presently required for mass concrete will add considerable expense. In all of the mass concrete that Anderson has been involved with we have never seen requirements for temperatures as low as required on this project. Not only will this be very difficult if not impossible to achieve it will be expensive.

Can this low temperature of 50 Deg F be re-evaluated? A common low concrete temperature at time of placement of mass concrete has been 65 Deg F and has worked satisfactorily. 65 Deg F is still difficult to achieve but can be done.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2006

Question Number: 42

The bridge on this project passes over the Scioto River just upstream of a small dam. Are there any controls on the dam to allow the water level to be lowered behind the dam through the bridge site? If not would it be possible to temporarily remove the top of one or two dam monoliths during the construction of the bridge to drop the water level 8 to 10'? Lowering the water level at the bridge site will save large amounts of money by reducing causeway costs, making construction of the new abutments & piers easier and reducing the demolition costs of the existing bridge. Are their historical hydrographs of the Scioto River flows available at this location available?

Question Submitted: 6/9/2006

Question Number: 43

We request that you please consider a two to four week postponement of the bid date for the subject project. Due to the complexity of this project. The Fabricators, Suppliers, Design Engineers and Proposed Subcontractors are requestig additional time to engineer and prepare their quotations. A delay of the bid date will ensure that ODOT recieves more competitive bids.

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.