Project No. 070080 Sale Date - 3/23/2007

Question Submitted: 1/31/2007 Question Number: 1

Can the quantity for Bid Item # 153 be checked it appears to be incorrect?

Question Submitted: 1/31/2007 Question Number: 2

Can the plans for the existing bridges be put on the website?

See ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/070080/

Question Submitted: 1/31/2007 Question Number: 3

Please check the quantity for Bid item 154 and revise in an addendum.

The quantity for bid item 154 has been checked and no change is required.

Question Submitted: 2/1/2007 Question Number: 4

The bid quantity for Bid item 154 needs to be checked. It seems to high.

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 2/15/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 5

1.Is the utility pole at station 981+70 rt behind the retaining wall being relocated?2.There are no borings for the rock cut area from station993 to 999. Are there any additional borings or original borings for this area?

The utility pole will remain in place and active. All soil boring information is included in the plans.

Question Submitted: 2/20/2007 Question Number: 6

There needs to be an each item for the guardrail hook-up on the concrete barrier single-slope, type D.(per RM 4.6, 3/3)

There are quantities for Bridge Terminal assemblies, Types 1 and 2 in the plans.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2007 Question Number: 7

Ref. 1- "Clearing and Grubbing, As Per Plan"...The "as per plan" note on sheet 16 states that there are no trees or stumps specifically marked for removal on the project. However, several plan sheets show trees marked for removal.Can ODOT please clarify if and what trees are to be removed and by who?

Numerous trees have already been removed for utility relocation work and Indiana bat trees. All remaining trees within the work zone shall be removed by the contractor.

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 2/21/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 8

In regard to maintenance of traffic and miscellaneous drainage items...There are several locations on the plans where new drainage crossovers are to be installed. The problem that will be encountered is that in some cases the low end of the crossover will be on the westbound side of US 422, which gets rebuilt in the second phase. Is the contractor to build 1/2 the crossover (under EB 422), cap off the pipe, and then finish when building WB 422? Is the contractor to build the crossover under WB US 422 while in phase 1 with temporary shutdowns and/or 1/2 width construction? Since the road is being rebuilt, will ODOT pay for all restoration under asphalt concrete for maintaining traffic if the WB 422 conduit is installed prior to reconstruction? Is the contractor to build the crossover under WB US 422 prior to going into phase 1 reconstruction of EB US 422? Will ODOT provide bid items and spell out how to install temporary drainage items (pipe, drainage structures) for out-of-phase pipe construction? Please clarify this situation in an addendum.

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 2/21/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 9

Bid item #5- "Pavement Removed, Asphalt"The subsummary spells out 2933 s.y. worth of the item as being an equivalent of 4' width on the right side of the existing pavement from stations 958+00 through 1024+86.20. The existing typical sections shown on plan sheets 7 and 8 do not show a 4' typical width, but a 2' width on one side.Can ODOT please verify the quantity and its correspondence to the existing typical section? There seems to be a conflict between typical sections and quantity subsummaries.

The typical sections shown in the plans are based upon record plans. When the designer performed their field surveys, additional asphalt was found and the plan quantities are based upon the field surveys. Please bid this item as per the plan quantities.

Question Submitted: 2/23/2007 Question Number: 10

In your response to your answer in the pre-bid questions, I mis-worded my question. To accommodate the Type 1 or 2 guardrail bridge terminal assemblies, there is a wall transition that is paid seperate. Under Item 622 concrete barrier end section Type D per standard drawing RM 4.6 3/3, this allows the assemblie to be bolted to the wall.

Question Submitted: 2/26/2007

Question Number: 11

Ref. 145- Work Zone Channelizing Line: engineer has 1035' setup for phase 1 on US 422. Plan sheet 25 shows a solid lane line from stations 920+00 to 903+35, which equates to 1035'. Which is correct for this location...solid lane line or channelizing line???

Work zone channelizing lines are channelizing lines

Question Submitted: 2/28/2007

Question Number: 12

In regards to Addendum #6, can ODOT please provide calculations for the revised bid items & added bid items? Is the intent for Ref.# 304, 448 TY-2 asphalt intermediate, to be the wearing surface for Hobart Road? If so should it be changed to a Type 2 surface course or include another item for 448 Type 1 surface course?

Question Submitted: 2/5/2007

Question Number: 13

1) Ref 148 is for 1393 Sq Yds of Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, however there is not an item for Roads for Maintaining Traffic. Will this item be added in a future addendum?2) There is no bid item for Topsoil to coincide with the Seeding & Mulching (ref 46). Will this item be added in a future addendum?

Question Submitted: 2/7/2007

Question Number: 14

The plan Quantity for Bid item # 168 Class C Concrete incl footings does not appear to have both the right & left bridges included. Please revise in an addendum

The plan quantities have been checked and the District believes them to be correct.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2007

Question Number: 15

The bridge plans show a detail for portable concrete barrier across the bridge deck, however, there is no pay item for this work. Please clarify.

The quantity for portable concrete barrier is on Sheet 22 of the plans and is Bid reference number 150 in the proposal.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2007

Question Number: 16

1. On bridge No. 422-1952 the plans show to remove the existing abutment footings. It appears that the top of the existing footings are at or close to the top of the Proposed permanent RCP. Is it ODOT's intent to remove concrete and replace it with RCP in the same location? Can the contractors leave the existing footing in place?

There is no way to put the RCP to grade and level per the specs without removing the footing. The answer is "Bid as is and the plans are clear, no change or addenda needed"

Question Submitted: 2/7/2007

Question Number: 17

Can Stay in place metal decking be used on bridge No 422-1952 over the Grand River?

Stay in place metal decking will not be allowed on this project.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2007

Question Number: 18

Structure General Note on plan sheet 222 regarding Slipformed parapets states that "Slip forming shall not be performed directly over areas where there is or will be vehicular or pedestrian traffic (which includes railroads and water crafts) At these locations, the parapets shall be formed and poured." Will either of these bridges have watercraft under them?

The Grand River is a scenic river and could have watercraft. No slip forming will be allowed at these locations.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2007

Question Number: 19

The bid quantity for Bid item 204 form liner includes the form liner on the concrete parapets that are on top of the approach slabs. Is it ODOT's intent to pay for all the form liner or just the form liner on the bridge deck? The concrete parapets on the approach slab are incidental to the approach slabs.

All the form liner will be paid for.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2007

Question Number: 20

In reference to your answer regarding the portable concrete barrier wall as shown on sheet 22 and bid as reference 150, on sheet 22, this wall is located between station 944+80 to station 951+00 in phase 2. See also the detail for this wall on sheet 32.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2007 Question Number: 21

Note 6 on plan sheet 257/232 states that all rebar for the approach slab is to be included in the approach slab bid item. The 2384 lbs of rebar shown on the rebar list under Approach Slab Parapet is included in the 51,113 lbs for bid item 192. Please clarify where this 2384 lbs of rebar is going to be paid for.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2007 Question Number: 22

A note on plan sheet 19 states that the contractor shall repair and resurface Hobart Road, as detailed on sheet 24, prior to detouring traffic. Hobart Rd is approximately 10,273 feet in length, which would result in over 1700 cubic yards of 301 asphalt, over 20,500 sq yd of Single Chip Seal with Polymer Binder, over 20,500 ln ft of Linear Grading, and over 20,500 sq yds of Subgrade Compaction. There are no quantities in the bid for these items. Will these items be added in a future addendum?

Question Submitted: 2/8/2007 Question Number: 23

It appears that Reinforcing mechanical connectors may be necesary at the construction phaseline for the footings and the abutment walls on bridge 422-1975. None are shown or referenced? Please advise.

The plans show lap splices. Mechanical connectors are not required.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2007 Question Number: 24

Westbound 422 traffic is to be detoured to Hobart Rd and Farmington Rd prior to the start of Phase 1, and is to remain in this detour configuration through Phase 2. As this project will not be completed until October 2008, who is responsible for snow and ice removal on the detour route?

The local maintaining agencies will be responsible for snow and ice removal.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2007 Question Number: 25

Plan sheet 21 indicates that Work Zone Impact Attenuators will be paid for with a seperate pay item, however I don't believe there is a pay item for the WZIA. I assume an item will be added if WZIA's are needed.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2007 Question Number: 26

ADDENDUM NO 1 INCREASED REF #153 TO 251 CY. SHOULD REF #160 (FORM LINER) HAVE BEEN INCREASED TOO?IT APPEARS THE LAP LENGTH OF THE ABUTMENT REINFORCING STEEL WILL BE IN CONFLICT WITH THE PHASE LINE SHEETING. PLEASE CONFIRM THE PHASE LINE SHEETING PLAN ON STRUCTURE GEA-422-1975 WILL NOT REQUIRE THE USE OF MECHANICAL CONNECTORS.

Question Submitted: 3/2/2007 Question Number: 27

In addenda #6, the plan quanity for reference 92, item #301 was changed from 3483cy to 1427cy. I believe the intent was to increase the quantity by the 1427cy not replace it. The quantity of 3483cy will be required for construction of 8" shoulders. The 1427cy will be required for paving of Hobart Road. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/2/2007 Question Number: 28

Ref. 90,91- Manufactured Water Quality Structures, Type 1 and Type 2: There are no details on the plans showing these items. Plan sheet 194A shows details for manhole #3 as per plan (Ref. 86), and the inflow/outflow pipes are clearly called out on the plans, but no detail is shown for the corresponding Type 1 and 2 structures. SS895 says to refer to ODOT Standard Drawing MH 1-2, but no further details are available. Standard Drawing WQ 1-1 for Water Quality Basins does not specify a type 1 or 2 either.

Can ODOT please provide more information?

Question Submitted: 3/2/2007 Question Number: 29

Addendum 9 changed the quantity of proof rolling (Ref. 28) down to 2 hours. Is the 2 hours meant for Hobart Road? Does ODOT mean to add 2 hours to the original 45 hours of mainline proof rolling to get 47 hours?

Question Submitted: 3/2/2007 Question Number: 30

Bid item 25- Subgrade Compaction: Addendum 6 revised the quantity to 20,546 s.y. which appears to be for use on Hobart Road. What about the original 90,242 s.y. of subgrade compaction for US 422, SR 282, and Reynolds? Should the revised quantity be 110,788 s.y.?

Question Submitted: 3/2/2007 Question Number: 31

Q) Can a bid item be added for 'Approach Slab Removal' for both structures?

Question Submitted: 3/21/2007 Question Number: 32

- 1.) Please see the plan note on page 222/332, Item 511, Class HP Concrete, As Per Plan. This note is requiring "All superstructure, bridge deck, and parapet concrete shall be this mix. All other structure concrete shall be this mix or mix 2 concrete." Reference numbers 168 and 193 are both structure concrete and are called out as Class C. Which concrete is to be used, Class HP, APP or Class C?2.) Will this job be awarded in time to allow any required clearing and grubbing to be done before the April 15th deadline?
 - 1). The proposal clearly indicates that reference 168 is for Structure GEA-422-1952 and reference 193 is for Structure GEA-422-1975. Bid as per plan 2). The contractor will be able to perform all required clearing and grubbing indicated in the plans. Bid as per plan

Question Submitted: 3/8/2007

Question Number: 33

Addendun No. 6 deleted the Replacement Drum item. This project will require over 500 drums to be in place in each phase, over a two year period. The Contractor will have to put some estimate of the replacement drum cost in the lump sum of maintaining traffic which defeats the purpose of the replacement drum item, which pays for only the actual replacements. Please consider reinstating the bid item previously deleted.

Question Submitted: 3/8/2007

Question Number: 34

On sheet 234 of 332 stage I bars are projecting 2'-9" into phase II. In the phase II section it shows a 3'-10" lap in a 3'-0" closure pour. Please verify if 2'9" is an acceptable lap for the #6 transverse bars.

Lap length of 2'-9" for transverse #6 bars is acceptable for the closure pour. The lengths shown in the reinforcing steel list for bars marks S609 and S610 are based on the 2'-9" dimension.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2007

Question Number: 35

Addendum No. 6 deleted the Replacement Drum item. This project will require over 500 drums to be in place in each phase, over a two year period. The Contractor will have to put some estimate of the replacement drum cost in the lump sum of maintaining traffic which defeats the purpose of the replacement drum item, which pays for only the actual replacements. Please consider reinstating the bid item previously deleted.

The Department respectfully declines to add a bid item for replacement drums.